2-12-2008

Having It All? Mothers' Experiences as Assistant Professors in Counseling Psychology Academia

Caroline Hecht Leavitt

ACCEPTANCE

This dissertation, HAVING IT ALL? MOTHERS' EXPERIENCES AS ASSISTANT PROFESSORS IN COUNSELING PSYCHOLOGY ACADEMIA, by CAROLINE HECHT LEAVITT, was prepared under the direction of the candidate's Dissertation Advisory Committee. It is accepted by the committee members in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Doctor of Philosophy in the College of Education, Georgia State University.

The Dissertation Advisory Committee and the student's Department Chair, as representatives of the faculty, certify that this dissertation has met all standards of excellence and scholarship as determined by the faculty. The Dean of the College of Education concurs.

_____
JoAnna F. White, Ed.D.
Committee Chair

_____
Catherine Brack, Ph.D.
Committee Member

_____
Gregory Brack, Ph.D.
Committee Member

_____
Catherine Chang, Ph.D.
Committee Member

_____
Date

_____
JoAnna F. White, Ed.D.
Chair, Department of Counseling and Psychological Services

_____
R.W. Kamphaus, Ph.D.
Dean and Distinguished Research Professor
College of Education

AUTHOR'S STATEMENT

By presenting this dissertation as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for the advanced degree from Georgia State University, I agree that the library of Georgia State University shall make it available for inspection and circulation in accordance with its regulations governing materials of this type. I agree that permission to quote, to copy from, or to publish this dissertation may be granted by the professor under whose direction it was written, but the College of Education's director of graduate studies and research, or by me. Such quoting, copying, or publishing must be solely for scholarly purposes and will not involve potential financial gain. It is understood that any copying from or publication of this dissertation which involves potential financial gain will not be allowed without my written permission.

_____

Caroline Leavitt

NOTICE TO BORROWERS

All dissertations deposited in the Georgia State University library must be used in accordance with the stipulations prescribed by the author in the preceding statement. The author of this dissertation is:

Caroline Hecht Leavitt
6230 Mountain Brook Lane
Sandy Springs, GA 30328

The director of this dissertation is:

Dr. JoAnna Ford White
Department of Counseling and Psychological Studies
College of Education
Georgia State University
Atlanta, GA 30303 - 3083

VITA

Caroline Hecht Leavitt

ADDRESS: 6230 Mountain Brook Lane
Sandy Springs, GA 30328

EDUCATION:

Ph.D.	2007	Georgia State University Counseling Psychology
M.A.	2000	Columbia University Teacher's College Applied Clinical Psychology
J.D.	1999	Columbia University Law School Law
B.A.	1996	Washington University in St. Louis Psychology

CLINICAL AND RESEARCH EXPERIENCE:

9/2006- Present	Psychologist Intern Clayton Center (Clayton Community Service Board)
8/ 2005 – 5/ 2006	Advanced Practicum Counselor Georgia Institute of Technology
8/ 2004 – 8/2005	Doctoral Intern in Psychology Peachtree Childtown
8/2001 – 8/2005	Research Assistant Georgia State University
8/2001 – 8/2003	Practicum Counselor GSU Counseling Center
6/2000 – 7/2001	Research Associate Center for Child Well-being
8/1999 – 5/2000	Research Assistant and Clinical Intern Smithers Substance Abuse Treatment Center, NY, NY

TEACHING EXPERIENCE

1/2003 – 5/2003	Instructor, Group Counseling Class Georgia State University
8/2001 – 5/2002	Instructor, 1050 Classes, August 2001 – May 2002 Georgia State University

PROFESSIONAL SOCIETIES AND ORGANIZATIONS:

1999-Present	American Psychological Association
2004-Present	Association for Play Therapy

PRESENTATIONS AND PUBLICATIONS

Blasko, L.S., Brasfield, C., & Leavitt, C.H. (2005, August). How to get (someone else to) fund your dissertation. Workshop presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Washington, D.C.

Brasfield, C., Ashby, J., Timmons, D., Martin, J., Bruner, L., Blasko, L.S., & Leavitt, C.H. (2003, August). Multidimensional perfectionism and coping among college students. Poster presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, Toronto, Canada.

Leavitt, C.H. (2005, October). *Your Child's Temperament.* Presentation given at Peachtree Childtown Child Development Center, Atlanta, Georgia.

Leavitt, C. H. & Brack, C. J. (2005). Relationship violence on campus: Prevalence and intervention. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Leavitt, C. H., Brack, C. J., Brasfield, C., Blasko, L. S., & Singh, A. (2003, August). *Relationship Violence on campus: Prevalence and prevention.* Poster presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, Toronto, Canada.

Leavitt, C. H., Tonniges, T. F., & Rogers, M. F. (2003). Good nutrition – The imperative for positive development. In M. H. Bornstein, L. Davidson, C. L. M. Keyes, & K. A. Moore (Eds.), *Well-being: Positive Development Across the Life Course* (pp. 35–49). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Leavitt, C.H. & White, J. (2005). The changing face of psychology? A review of women's progress in psychology's academia. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Tonniges, T. F., & Leavitt, C. H. (2003). Preventive health care in early childhood and through the life span. In M. H. Bornstein, L. Davidson, C. L. M. Keyes, & K. A. Moore (Eds.), *Well-being: Positive Development Across the Life Course* (pp. 51–64). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Zaff, J. F., Smith, D. C., Rogers, M. F., Leavitt, C. H., Halle, T. G., & Bornstein, M. H. (2003). Holistic well-being and the developing child. In M. H. Bornstein, L. Davidson, C. L. M. Keyes, & K. A. Moore (Eds.), *Well-being: Positive Development Across the Life Course* (pp. 23-32). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

ABSTRACT

HAVING IT ALL? MOTHERS' EXPERIENCES AS ASSISTANT PROFESSORS IN COUNSELING PSYCHOLOGY ACADEMIA

by

Caroline H. Leavitt

For approximately the past 20 years, women have earned significantly more Ph.D.'s in the area of counseling psychology than men. However, women continue to lag with regard to rates of tenure and promotion in counseling psychology academia. Despite the significant amount of theoretical literature, there is limited empirical research on this gender disparity. The current study is designed to begin filling this gap in the literature.

For this study, ten female assistant professors in counseling psychology were interviewed to elicit information about their experiences as academicians. All of the participants were mothers of minor children. A standardized interview protocol was used and interviews were audio-taped. The interviews were then transcribed and subject to a multi-step coding process. The coding process revealed six domains, each with multiple primary and secondary themes. The domains include: Culture, Mentorship, Work-Family Conflict, Gender Discrimination/Harassment, Intrapersonal dynamics, and Recommendations. All ten participants were represented in all of the domains except for gender discrimination which had an n=9. Generally, the participants' experiences supported the literature's explanations for the continuing gender gap in counseling psychology academia. If universities are committed to including women in all ranks of

the academy, multi-faceted changes must be made to acknowledge, accommodate, and respect women's priorities and values.

HAVING IT ALL? MOTHERS' EXPERIENCES AS ASSISTANT PROFESSORS IN COUNSELING PSYCHOLOGY ACADEMIA

by

Caroline H. Leavitt

A Dissertation

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of Requirements for the
Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
in
Counseling Psychology
in
the Department of Counseling and Psychological Services
in
the College of Education
Georgia State University

Atlanta, GA
2007

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am forever grateful to my family and friends who have provided me with support, love, and encouragement during the past seven years. My special thanks go to the following people:

Jeffrey Leavitt, my husband and best friend - Thank you for riding this wild ride with me and putting up with me during many hours of classes, papers, practicum, dissertation, and internship. I cannot begin to express how much I appreciate your love, devotion, and friendship through all of this.

David and Noah Leavitt, my wonderful sons - You have helped me to remember what is truly important in life and given me perspective. Thank you for your many smiles, laughs, and sloppy, delicious kisses.

Mom and Marc and Dad and Lorena and Mom and Dad Leavitt – I do not know what I would have done without you. Your constant support for Jeff, David, Noah and me made completion of my doctoral program possible. No daughter could ask for better parents!

My extended family – Mimi and Poppy, Amy, Jacquie and Crosby – From Mimi's soups of love, to Jacquie and Amy's willingness to help out in a pinch, to Crosby's running of my household and caring for my children – you are all lifesavers.

Claudia, my wonderful and dear friend – our friendship sustained me through both wonderful and difficult times. Thank you for your unconditional love and support – you are a true friend.

JoAnna White, my mentor and advisor – I respect and admire your passion for children, your compassion and professionalism, and your devotion to your students. Your encouragement, wisdom and teaching have helped me succeed in my doctoral work.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

CHAPTER 1

THE CHANGING FACE OF PSYCHOLOGY: A REVIEW OF WOMEN'S ACHIEVEMENTS AND STRUGGLES IN PSYCHOLOGY'S ACADEMIA

The American Psychological Association's Task Force on Women in Academe released a comprehensive report in 2000 reviewing the progress made and challenges faced by women in psychological academe. Since 1986, more women have graduated from doctoral programs in Psychology in the United States than men (51% of doctoral degrees in Psychology awarded to women that year) with the gap continuing to widen through the mid 1990's (66% of all doctoral degrees in various areas of psychology were awarded to women in 1996) (American Psychological Association (APA) Taskforce on Women in Academe, 2000).

More specifically, a summary report conducted in 1996 reported that more women than men earned doctoral degrees that year in all areas in psychology aside from cognitive and psycholinguistics and psychometrics and quantitative where men earned a marginally larger number of degrees (APA Task Force on Women in Academe, 2000). In some cases, such as counseling psychology (303 Ph.D.s awarded to women compared with 161 awarded to men), clinical psychology (919 Ph.D.s awarded to women compared with 406 awarded to men), and school psychology (152 Ph.D.s awarded to women compared with 44 awarded to men), the gender difference is striking (APA Task Force on Women in Academe). Additionally, many women choose to enter higher education after earning their doctorates with the total number of female assistant professors and

lecturers/instructors (adjunct professors) in all areas of psychology equaling or exceeding 50% (APA Task Force on Women in Academe). This data suggests that as many women as men desire a career in higher education and hope to make this their life's work by achieving tenure or more senior positions within their departments.

Despite the dominance of women in doctoral programs and the equal or greater participation of women in lower levels of academia, women continue to comprise a significantly smaller percentage of tenured professors than men (APA Task Force on Women in Academe, 2000; Halpern, 2004). The statistics vary. However, all show that men consistently outrank women. For example, one source indicates that 44% of full-time female faculty hold tenure compared to 68% of male full-time faculty (Kite, et al., 2001). Another document shows 30% of all female faculty to be tenured compared with 52% of all male faculty (Rabasca, 2000). Moreover, the gender discrepancy is even greater when one looks at full-professorship status. While 45% of men hold this prestigious rank, only 27% of females achieve this status (Kite, et al.). While the statistics describing women's progress in psychology academia are not encouraging, they are far superior to those describing the progress of women in higher education generally. Those numbers demonstrate a dire problem with only 22% of all female faculty across disciplines achieving tenure (Halpern).

While the numbers are clear, the causes of this disparity between the genders are not. What accounts for this marked gender difference? Investigators have done research on the specific challenges and difficulties that female students face (Ancis & Phillips, 1996; Nosek, Banaji, & Greenwald, 2002, Steele, 1997) as well as the students'perceptions of female professors (Stewart, Berkvens, Engels, & Pass, 2003;

Takiff, Sanchez, & Stewart, 2001). However, scientists have conducted very little empirical research on the lack of senior female faculty in Psychology or other areas of academia.

There are two exceptions with regard to empirical research. The first is a study by Riemenschnieder and Harper (1990), which demonstrates that female faculty reported concomitant employment and caregiving more stressful and guilt provoking than male faculty. The second empirical study is by Moyer Salovey and Casey-Cannon (1999). This is a qualitative study, which found common themes of concern about finding employment, financial stability, and developing professional expertise among 224 female doctoral students or recent graduates.

Despite the limited empirical work, there is a substantial amount of theoretical literature on this phenomenon. The majority of these works suggest that there are multitudes of gender attributable reasons why women psychologists fail to achieve equal stature in higher education. These reasons are varied. For example, some women struggle with issues of self-presentation, socialization and acceptance into departments that are either male dominated or at the very least, maintain a male oriented culture that makes many women feel excluded. Some appear to be examples of a subtle, yet pervasive manifestation of covert discrimination similar to the subtle gender bias that is reported to exist in the corporate world (Heilman, 2001). Still others have to do with the role strain and stress that result from conflict between work and family obligations.

It is noteworthy to mention two nonempirical articles, one by Bleske-Rechek and Webb (2002) and the other by Harris (2002) which do not follow the typical trajectory laid out by the majority of the literature. These authors wrote their articles in response to

the aforementioned APA report in an effort to dispute the implication that issues related to gender are the cause of the inequities in the success of female professors. The authors express alarm at the suggestion that universities should change in order to allow more women to achieve tenure fearing that such alterations would be perceived as special treatment for women who could not make it otherwise (Harris).

Despite these anomalies, most of the literature suggests one of three reasons for the continuing gender gap. The first is the patriarchal culture and climate that pervades most universities. Second, much of the literature focuses on the conflict between work and family with which many academics struggle. Third, is the prevalence of overt and covert gender discrimination. In sum, the literature proposes that women in academia continue struggle to adapt themselves to the demands and constraints required of them in order to achieve success in research universities. The goal of this article is to review and evaluate the many components of this supposition.

Departmental Culture and Climate

Turning a long-standing, traditionally patriarchal, hierarchical institution into one with a climate and culture that is overtly and covertly welcoming to women is no easy task. However, this goal needs to be a top priority for departments that fail to create an equitable climate for women (Rabasca, 2000). A 1993 National Center on Educational Statistics (NCES) national survey demonstrates the need for a change in departmental and university climate and culture. In this survey, the existence of women's felt inequity is obvious when 40% of women psychology faculty surveyed disagreed with the statement "Female faculty members are treated fairly at this institution" [referring to their own university] (NCES, 1993).

It seems universities can choose from one of two paths when attempting to change their climate so that women feel accepted and comfortable. The first is what appears to be the path that most universities have already chosen – accepting women into the professorial ranks, but requiring them to adapt to the rules, procedures, and cultural milieu already in place. However, given the numbers already discussed (APA, 2000; Kite, et al., 2001), this approach does not appear to be working.

The second option is to change the long-entrenched departmental and university culture so that it more accurately reflects and respects women's leadership styles, values, skills, and priorities. While it may be more difficult to bring these goals to fruition, it most likely will result in a better outcome with regard to gender equity in the academy.

There are some easily identifiable examples of how the higher education climate continues to make it difficult for women in psychology to succeed. For instance, by failing to equally support and respect many of the lines of research of interest to female faculty, departments may implicitly be harboring gender biases that female faculty feel but cannot easily identify or describe (Rabasca, 2000). This lack of support may arise from the department chair's priorities, but it also could arise from larger forces within and outside of the university such as state legislatures (if the school is a state school), university presidents, provosts, and deans. Often, women in the social sciences such as psychology have research interests and make methodological choices that are not in line with those that are currently in vogue. Therefore, women with nontraditional research interests often are not able to compete for grant money and other valuable resources with those who choose more mainstream or popular research interests (Capaldi, 2004).

Moreover, by not valuing or giving equal status to many of the tasks and roles that many women enjoy or are assigned to, such as mentoring and advising students or participating in community service (APA, 2000), universities and departments knowingly, or unknowingly assign women to second class status. The ways in which issues related to departmental socialization, mentorship, and self-presentation impact women's achievement are discussed below.

Departmental Socialization

Departmental socialization is an extensive and continuous process that includes both personal and professional tasks. The new psychology professor undertakes this taxing process after already successfully finishing a demanding doctoral program and undergoing the rigors of a national job search for an academic position – both of which have their own challenges. Success in this area is essential, however, for establishing a professional identity and for fully developing one's career (Eberspacher & Sisler, 1988).

Feldman put forth one model of organizational socialization in 1976. Feldman's contingency theory of socialization suggests that there are three distinct socialization stages for professionals. The first stage is anticipatory socialization, in which the new professor attempts to understand her new organization prior to beginning work. The second stage, the accommodation stage, takes place when the new professional first begins working. In this stage the professor seeks role clarity, collegial relationships, mastery of work related tasks, and understanding of the organization. The third stage, role management, is one in which the professor attempts to manage conflicts between outside demands and on-the-job demands and settles conflicts that take place within the

workplace, such as unrealistic expectations from more senior employees or an unfair allocation of job responsibilities. (Feldman, 1976).

To make this model especially applicable to the field of psychology, Fouad and Carter (1992) put forth one example of some specific socialization tasks that new counseling psychologists must accomplish. Their example states that the neophyte professor must: find and maintain a support system in the city in which she has relocated; establish and maintain relationships within her academic department; learn, understand, and follow the explicit and implicit expectations and demands that are a part of the position; and establish and be assertive enough to maintain a research program within the department (Feldman, 1976; Fouad & Carter).

Fouad and Carter (1992) assert that for the female professor, the already psychologically, emotionally, and physically draining socialization process may have additional challenges. For example, in most universities, the socialization process is unstructured and informal and women often feel isolated and unsupported due to the preponderance of male faculty and the patriarchal culture that pervades most academic departments including psychology (Fouad & Carter; Kite et al., 2001).

Additionally, female professors, particularly those new to the field, often lack or are uncomfortable with using political skills that are required to remain a viable player within the department. These political skills are particularly necessary in order to comply with departmental expectations and demands without being unfairly burdened with requirements that have been traditionally passed off onto women (such as planning social functions and service obligations). Moreover, political skills are needed for maintaining

and growing a research program in a department where individuals are competing for limited resources.

Moreover, new professors must also have the skills necessary to advance their careers (Fouad & Carter, 1992). According to the authors, career advancement skills include being comfortable taking risks, being able to safeguard rights, being able to put ones career first, and being competent at creating opportunities for oneself (Fouad & Carter). Fouad and Carter suggest that many academic women have difficulty mastering the skills necessary to advance their careers possibly due to messages internalized from the larger society about appropriate behavior for women, concerns about self presentation, difficulties with assertiveness, and/or a lack of support from within, or outside of, the department. These authors suggest that due to these challenges many women do not successfully integrate or socialize into their academic departments.

Mentorship

Another hypothesized reason for the disproportionate number of successful female academicians in psychology concerns the lack of appropriate and effective mentorship by senior professors. Mentorship is viewed as critical to assisting junior professors accomplish many of the socialization tasks mentioned above; in giving new professors emotional, intellectual, and practical support; and in assisting those new to the profession in coping with and balancing the demands placed on them from both their career and personal life (Eberspacher & Sisler, 1988; Fouad & Carter, 1992).

Specifically, a study by Knox and McGovern (1988), reported that women in particular are looking for their mentors to be "willing to share knowledge, honest, competent, willing to let [the mentee] grow, willing to give positive and critical feedback,

and [be] direct in dealings with me" (p. 40). In the same article, respondents reported that the qualities they hoped to find in a mentor included being "understanding," providing "consistent treatment," knowing "about the academic professional 'system,'" being "knowledgeable about the use of power," being "practical," and someone who would push the mentee "to define and clarify [her] goals" (Knox & McGovern, p. 40).

As noted above, many women do not achieve the senior levels within their departments and consequently, there are very few female mentors for the new female faculty. Therefore, it is quite likely that adequate mentors, who serve in the roles, understand the issues and challenges that are unique to female faculty, and have the character traits desired by the female junior professors, are in short supply (Fouad & Carter, 1992). Moreover, the research on the mentoring relationship has noted that mentors are significantly more likely to enter a mentoring relationship with an individual of the same gender (Eberspacher & Sisler, 1988; Fouad & Carter).

Finally, the mentor-protégé relationship is also one that is, by its very nature, a disproportionate allocation of power (Young & Wright, 2001). The power issues that are part of the mentor relationship are potentially exacerbated in situations when the mentee is a woman and the mentor is a man. This may be particularly true in cases where the majority of senior faculty are male and the overall climate of the department is patriarchal (Capaldi, 2004; Knox & McGovern, 1988).

Self-Presentation

Women often struggle with issues of self-presentation, both in the classroom and within their department. As a group that has traditionally and culturally been an outsider in higher education, women are often more cognizant and self-conscious about how their

colleagues and students perceive them (Hackett, Betz, & Doty, 1985; Kite, et al., 2001; Park & Nolen-Hoeksema, 2004; Rooke, 1989). To achieve professionally, women frequently must break into university and professional networks that are exclusive and patriarchal. In order to do so successfully, females often must abandon or suppress parts of themselves, their research passions, unique ideologies, and epistemologically nontraditional bodies of knowledge and adopt roles, ways of being, and pursuits that are nonthreatening to men (Rooke; Williams, 2004).

For example, one issue that produces discord for women is the struggle between being respected and being liked (Kite, et al., 2001). The research summarized in the 2001 article by Kite et al., demonstrates this problem. The literature indicates that women who present as typically feminine are often considered appropriate for hiring but are not perceived as overly competent. Alternatively, women who do not present with characteristics traditionally ascribed to women will often not be hired, despite their perceived competence, because they are not seen as influential or likable.

Moreover, a research article by Hacket, Betz, and Doty (1985), which developed a career taxonomy for professional women, indicates that women perceive and experience nongendered tasks differently than men. Women also have some tasks, including those related to self- presentation, that are gender specific, and therefore, qualitatively different than the tasks that must be accomplished by successful men. For example, the taxonomy states that in order to satisfy self-efficacy expectations women must be able to "calm herself down", manage "sexist behavior and attitudes" "blow her own horn", and change "feminine response set for verbal modesty" (Hacket et al., p. 401). These are just some

of the unique self-presentation tasks and concerns that women must negotiate in addition to those shared by men.

Finally, the text of chapter for women in the book *The Compleat Academic: A Career Guide 4th ed.*, (2004) itself speaks to the quandary in which academic women often find themselves. The laundry list of "do's and don'ts" for academic women in this chapter is lengthy and sets standards that seem impossible to obtain. The first section of this chapter is on presentation of self. The authors advise women to make sure they are perceived as "productive and smart and someone who will contribute to the intellectual life of the department over the long haul while doing her fair share of the departmental work" in lieu of being reliable, helpful, friendly, and compassionate (Park & Nolen-Hoeksema, p. 312). The authors also caution not to express concerns or insecurities about one's abilities but, at the same time, to avoid "obsessively worrying about getting tenure because these types of behavior will undermine positive perceptions" (Park & Nolen-Hoeksema, p. 312).

Women are also encouraged to refrain from demonstrating vulnerabilities to colleagues and from sharing personal stresses or difficulties at the workplace. Moreover, women should also be highly concerned about dress and physical appearance, but at the same time should "be themselves" (Park & Nolen-Hoeksema, p. 213, 2004).

Additionally, the authors discuss the difficulties women encounter when perceived as warm and compassionate. The authors warn that warm and compassionate women will typically be less able to do their own job because of having to satisfy the needs and demands of others, will be perceived as an easy, undemanding professor by students, will be exploited within the department, will fall prey to gender stereotypes, and

will become overcommitted (2004). It seems that the problem for academic women may lie not in being warm and compassionate, demonstrating that they are human through the expression of concerns or imperfections, or dressing in a casual manner. Rather the difficulty women experience may be in attempting to satisfy all of all of the requirements discussed in this chapter, which is likely an encapsulation of the self-presentation concerns of women in academia.

Work/Family Conflict

The literature also suggests that role overload and role conflict combined with the inflexible institutional demands of many universities may contribute to the lackluster rates at which women are succeeding in higher education. A much-discussed issue in both the academic and popular literature and one of the priorities of the most recent past president of the American Psychological Association (see APA Presidential Initiative on Work and Family, 2004; Halpern, 2004) is the fact that the timeline of the tenure track overlaps with the reproductive years of most women.

In addition to childbearing falling to women by biological necessity, women continue to bear the primary responsibility for caregiving and household responsibilities (APA Task Force on Women in Academe, 2000; APA Presidential Initiative on Work and Family, 2004; Fouad & Carter, 1992; Halpern, 2004; Park & Nolen-Hoeksema, 2004; Riemenschinieder & Harper, 1990). These work/family conflict issues affect both men and women (Kelloway, Gottlieb, & Barham, 1999). However, the disproportionate burden on women may make it extremely difficult for women who choose to have children to give her career the same prioritization as her male counterparts (Caplan,

2003). It also requires many women to develop sophisticated coping strategies to manage successfully all of her demands (Caplan; Fouad & Carter).

Moreover, heterosexual women with doctorates are typically married to men who also have advanced degrees while the same is not true for heterosexual men with Ph.D.s. The conflict between trying to balance two highly demanding careers versus having most or all of the family resources available to support one, takes its toll on women academicians. Additionally, women in higher education are typically without the geographic freedom enjoyed by their male counterparts to take the best (or in some cases only) available job anywhere in the country due to their husband or partner's career demands (Marwell, Rosenfeld, & Spilerman, 1979). The existing literature suggests that these burdens may be unique to women and without institutional or at the very least, departmental modifications and support, many women will find the burdens too much to bear and will drop out or be forced out of the profession.

The Effect of Having Children on Women's Professional Success

The empirical and theoretical articles cited throughout this literature review suggest that women's academic careers are disproportionately impeded by a variety of factors. However, two articles, both by Mason and Goulden (2002; 2004), have suggested that the most important indicator of whether a woman will succeed in academia is whether she has children. Both of these studies look at faculty in the sciences and humanities in addition to the social sciences. Despite the lack of focus on psychology specifically, the authors emphasize that the data they examined remains surprisingly consistent across disciplines (Mason & Goulden, 2002). This suggests that

this data and the interpretations based upon it are reflective of the patterns and trends that take place in psychology departments.

In the 2002 article, Mason and Goulden use the metaphor of a human body when discussing the proportion of various types of workers at universities. The authors demonstrate that both the male and female bodies are disproportionate. While the male body has a disproportionately large head and shoulders (representing faculty and highest levels of administration), the female body has a disproportionately small head and shoulders with a very large neck (representing second tier or adjunct faculty/lecturers) and torso (representing low level positions in administration and staff).

In order to explain this phenomenon, Mason and Goulden looked at data from 1973 to 1999 from the Survey of Doctorate Recipients. What they found is that a substantial proportion of the variance between males and females achieving tenure can be accounted for by whether or not academic women have babies. This baby phenomenon is particularly salient for women who decide to have a baby within the first five years of her academic career. In this case, the tenure achievement gap between women in the social sciences who have babies early in their careers and men in the social sciences who have babies early in their careers is approximately 20% (Mason & Goulden, 2002). Men who have babies within the first five years not only are not hurt by this decision but actually achieve tenure at a somewhat higher rate than individuals who do not have children during this time period (Mason & Goulden, 2002). The inability for women with children to close the tenure gap in academia is often referred to as the "maternal wall" and this phenomenon will be discussed in detail in the next section of this review.

In their second article, Mason and Goulden (2004) investigate the other side of the baby gap issue – whether women who forego having children in the early years of their career are able to later balance their professional success of achieving tenure with having a family. The resounding answer is no. Using the same source of data for their second article, the authors found that only one third of women who are childless when they earn tenure ever have a child. Additionally, tenured men are only half as likely as tenured women to be single 12 years after earning a Ph.D., and women who were married when they began their academic careers are significantly more likely than their male counterparts to be divorced or separated from their partners (Mason & Goulden, 2004).

Of course, it is possible that some women in academia will choose not to have children. In order to tease apart the cause of the small number of post-tenure births, Mason and Goulden (2004) surveyed all faculty members of the University of California higher education system. There results indicate that 38% of all female respondents were unable to have as many children as they would have liked.

Some theorists and policy makers believe that the reason for women lagging behind with regard to professional achievement is that women choose lower status jobs in order to spend more time with their children (Crosby, Williams, Biernat, 2004). However, this premise is based on the assumption that women are free to choose. Rather the system and the culture and myths that maintain it are set up to create a zero-sum game for professional women. They either must sacrifice motherhood or delegate the majority of their child's care to someone else, or they are forced into career marginalization (Cohen, 2004). Women are consistently forced to make this "choice". Men rarely must do so.

The Maternal Wall and the Ideal Worker

The concept of the modern day maternal wall has its roots in what most individuals consider archaic notions about women. For example, one of the earliest foundations of the maternal wall is the concept of women as the weaker sex for whom the rigors of the workplace were not suitable (Barnett, 2004). Once women were admitted in larger numbers to the workforce, the marital wall was erected even in woman-dominated professions such as teaching (Barnett). Women could work as long as they were single – once married, working was considered inappropriate due to the perception of an inherent conflict between career and family. The designers and enforcers of this policy assumed that for women, family obligations would, or at the very least should, come first. Therefore, women's place in the workforce was incompatible with their role as a wife. Even once marital bans were abandoned, pregnancy bans took their place and remained common until the late 1960s (Barnett).

In order to understand the maternal wall, it is necessary to understand two other concepts – first, the faulty, culturally bound cognitions which support and maintain the maternal wall, and second, the idea of the ideal worker. The maternal wall is a hold over from the aforementioned employment policies and work restrictions on women. It also has the same underpinning – a culturally held belief that women are uniquely suitable and capable for taking care of children due to their inherent nurturing, warmth, and caring, and that in order for children to develop properly, women must be with their children full time (Barnett, 2004). Due to this belief, a woman who works, particularly one who chooses to work for personal satisfaction rather than due to financial need, is considered by many to be outside the norm and is often treated punitively by others including her

employers (Barnett; Bond, Thompson, Galinsky, & Prottas, 2002; Crosby et al., 2004; Cuddy, Fiske, & Glick, 2004; Deutsch & Saxon, 1998; Ridgeway & Correll, 2004).

Additionally, a dominant under girding of the maternal wall are biases that the workplace commonly employs against women with children. For example, mothers are often assumed to be incompetent (Cuddy, Fiske, & Glick, 2004) and are frequently the recipients of benevolent stereotyping (telling mothers what is appropriate based on good intentions). Women are also often subjected to role incongruity (the belief that one cannot be a good mother and a good employee or that a particular job is not appropriate for a mother), and attribution bias (the belief that whenever a woman is not in the office, she is with her children rather than on a business trip, at a business meeting etc.) (Williams, 2005).

The other cultural myth that is alive and well in the United States is the idea of the ideal worker. The ideal worker is one who begins working in his early twenties, is completely dedicated to his career, works full time throughout the life of his career, takes no time off for childbearing or child rearing, and remains in the same line of employment until his retirement in his early to mid-sixties (Crosby, et al, 2004). Universities and psychology departments in the United States consistently promote and maintain the ideal worker myth and mentality as demonstrated by the reluctance by these institutions to change the system in order to better accommodate the needs of a large number of its professionals (APA, 2000; Lobel, 2004; Quinn, Lange, & Olswang, 2004; Sullivan, Hollenshead, & Smith, 2004).

Due to the pervasiveness of the ideal worker mentality, if academic women want to succeed professionally, they must do their best to accommodate the rules established

by the needs, preferences, and beliefs of males (Nelson & Burke, 2002). In order to do this, academic women typically find that they either have to sacrifice having children, or, if they do have children, they must be able to maintain the work ethic, schedule, and commitment of their male counterparts despite the fact that they continue to do the majority of the child rearing (Crosby et al., 2004). Maintaining this rigorous lifestyle is likely to lead to work-family conflict, stress, and decreased coping resources, which can have a deleterious effect on both a woman's work and family life (Kelloway, et al., 1999).

Although the current maternal wall is not an overt policy as were its predecessors, the research suggests that its covert presence has a highly damaging effect on women's careers (Barnett, 2004; Crosby, et al., 2004; Cuddy, et al., 2004; Deutsch & Saxon, 1998; Families and Work Institute, 2002; Nelson & Burke, 2002; Ridgeway & Correll, 2004). For example, some social psychology researchers have investigated the effect that motherhood has on workplace outcomes. One study by Ridgeway and Correll (2004) argues that, due to motherhood's diminished social status, once a woman has a child, evaluations of a woman's workplace performance are likely to plummet regardless of her previous employment evaluations or her actual post-motherhood performance. More specifically, this study states that the specific conflict between the "good mother" and the "ideal worker" myths account for this downward progression and that motherhood will lead to greater decreases in performance and competence evaluations than many other devalued status groups. These researchers also believe that professional women, such as academicians, will most strongly feel and be affected by the conflict between the aforementioned myths and the resulting perceptions of incompetence and lack of

commitment. Ridgeway and Correll expect this outcome due to the pervasive presence of the ideal worker myth in higher education and similar professions and the resulting belief that in order to succeed in a high-powered career, one must be available at all times and be unfettered by other responsibilities.

Two articles support Ridgeway and Correll's theories. The first article demonstrates that pregnant working women are victims of significant bias when individuals are asked to evaluate their performance (Halpert, Wilson, & Hickman, 1993). Pregnant women were consistently rated as less competent than nonpregnant women were, particularly when the rater was male. Moreover, raters viewed pregnant women as too emotional, physically restricted, illogical, lacking in value, and undependable (Halpert et al.).

Additionally, an empirical article investigated university students' perceptions of working mothers and fathers as well as childless women and men (Cuddy et al., 2004). While childless men and women did not differ with regard to their perceived competence or perceived warmth (they were both perceived as more competent than warm), the perceptions of working parents changed significantly and differently for men and women. When men became parents, they maintained the same level of perceived competence and increased their levels of perceived warmth. However, when women became parents, the results were strikingly different. Women's levels of perceived warmth went up. However, women's workplace competence levels decreased dramatically (Cuddy et al.). Additionally, these researchers found that individuals are less interested in hiring, educating, and promoting mothers when compared to childless men and women or fathers. Finally, competence ratings were predictive of individual's interests in

educating, hiring and promoting workers. Therefore, once women professionals become mothers, their drop in perceived competence significantly hurts them professionally (Cuddy, et al.).

Finally, a 1998 empirical investigation by Deutsch and Saxon revealed that men and women operate under double standards with regard to received praise and criticism about their employment and family roles. Men received more praise for being involved fathers. However, they also reported significant amounts of criticism for being too involved at home and not involved enough at work. Alternatively, mothers reported some praise for successfully combining work and family but primarily reported criticism for being not involved enough at home and being too involved in work outside the home (Deutsch & Saxon).

These results are troubling not only because of the criticism that women receive, but also due to the stress that seemingly dominant attitudes have on "nontraditional" families and gender roles. The resilience of the good mother and ideal worker myths in the United States put enormous pressure on men and women to comply with traditional caregiver/worker roles. Adherence prevents either gender from escaping the trap of the ideal worker. This leaves both men and women isolated in their respective roles and resigns many women to the "mommy track" in the workplace (Deutsch & Saxon, 1998; Williams, 2000; Williams, 2002).

Due to research universities' reputation for possessing a liberal, forward-thinking atmosphere, it might be assumed that female academics who are also mothers would not have as much difficulty as might be encountered by other professional women. However, due to the need for total dedication to one's work, inflexible tenure track requirements,

and the continued existence of gender stereotypes, academia is typically not a haven from the maternal wall but often is just the opposite (Williams, 2005).

Family-Friendly Policy Implementation and Faculty Participation

Some argue that by making the decision to have children, women are freely choosing to give up their career and make professional goals secondary to personal ones. However, women are not in a position to make these choices voluntarily due to the institutional requirements of their work environment and the demands of their dependant family members. Rather mothers are, more often than not, economically marginalized (Curtis, 2004, Williams, 2000, 2002, 2005). Moreover, men also "choose" to have children but are rarely forced into a position of having to sacrifice their career aspirations in order to do so (Curtis).

Many universities recognize the challenges that women face when attempting to succeed in academia, particularly when they have outside obligations such as children or other caregiving responsibilities. In an effort to combat the difficulties that women encounter when trying to balance their academic careers with family responsibilities, universities have implemented various family-friendly policies. Some examples of these policies include paid parental leave, stopping the tenure clock, modification of duties, and dependent-care leaves (Sullivan et al., 2004). However, there is evidence that despite universities good intentions, faculty often do not take advantage of these family-friendly policies.

One article shows that the low rates at which faculty take advantage of these policies is typically due to the lack of or inadequate policies, faculty that is afraid to use the policies for fear of career retribution, or a low level of participation making the

culture one in which using these policies is perceived as deviating from the norm (Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2004). Another study attributes the failures of university policies to poor communication and dissemination of information about the policies, lack of centralized, university wide policy implementation, and ineffective or inadequate data collection so that it is not possible to evaluate the effectiveness of the policies (Quinn et al., 2004).

Authors Ward and Wolf-Wendel (2004) believe that the underlying cause for all of these policy difficulties at universities is fear. According to these researchers, the fear is not the property of faculty alone, but extends to the larger university population including the senior administrators. While the authors believe that faculty's fear stems primarily from concern about negative repercussions on their career, administrators fears include being perceived as imparting special treatment on one group, altering the long-standing tenure timeline and structure, financial costs, and compromising the university's reputation for research and scholarship (Ward & Wolf-Wendel). Some universities are also concerned that allowing flexible policies for some will lead to a demand for flexible policies for all, and that they will be unable to formalize and enforce eligibility requirements leading to confusion and conflict among faculty and the administration (Lobel, 2004).

How can universities encourage the use of family-friendly policies once they are implemented? A study conducted at the Center for the Education of Women at the University of Michigan found that for faculty to use university policies successfully, the university must fulfill a number of criteria (Sullivan et al., 2004). First, the university needs to have formal policies that they treat as entitlements. Second, universities must

continually communicate with and educate the faculty and administrators about the policies. Third, the university must make concerted efforts to address and defuse issues that dissuade faculty from using the policies. Fourth, university officials need to foster collaboration between advocates of individual policies and pertinent institutional committees. Finally, Sullivan et al. report that universities should use data to promote the effectiveness of their family-friendly policies.

In addition to these specific findings, Sullivan et al. (2004) also stated that having the specific support of the university president, provost, and deans of the colleges, were essential to having successful family-friendly policies. Moreover the authors reported that a formalized process of assessing department chairs' and deans' "family friendliness," the establishment of commissions to evaluate the status of women at the university, and the unionization of faculty all contributed to the success of family friendly policies (Sullivan et al.).

Sex Discrimination

The literature suggests that sex or gender discrimination is another prominent factor in the difficulties that women have achieving tenure and promotion at the same rates as men. Specifically, the glass ceiling, difficulties establishing competence, and being penalized for being too competent will be reviewed in this section.

The Glass Ceiling

Society has long used the glass ceiling term to describe the inevitable limitations most women encounter in their efforts to succeed in either the corporate world or academia. This glass ceiling results from the many stereotypes and overtly or covertly discriminatory policies, practices and cultures with which women must struggle in their

efforts to become successful in these environments (Dinerman, 1971; Knights & Richards, 2003; Ridgeway & Correll, 2004; Williams, 2005). Women in higher education are actually trapped between two glass ceilings – one in which they have to work extra hard to prove their competence and the second in which they are punished for possessing too much competence (Williams, 2005). Additionally, women are frequently unable to strike a balance between being assertive and being feminine. If they are perceived as too feminine, they are criticized for not being qualified; if they are seen as not feminine enough, they may succeed in being perceived as competent but are viewed as lacking in social skills (Williams, 2005).

Difficulties Establishing Competence

A seminal article by legal scholar Joan Williams (2003) dissects the social psychology literature to describe the various biases that lead to glass ceiling discrimination. Williams first describes the biases that make it difficult for women to establish competence. The incompetence assumption draws on empirical research that has demonstrated that, while men's competence is assumed unless they do something to prove otherwise, coworkers and superiors assume women are incompetent. Therefore, women must prove their competence repeatedly (Williams, 2003).

The leniency bias is based on the long held and much researched social psychology theory that in-group members receive preferential treatment over out-group members (Sherif, White, Harvey, 1955; Williams, 2003). Since men are the dominant gender in academia, they typically make up the in-group. Therefore, men are evaluated more favorably, are given greater rewards, and are given greater leniency than women. The leniency bias therefore contributes to the difficulties women have in establishing

competence (Williams, 2003). A related issue is the recall bias in which research suggests that women's mistakes will be remembered for a longer period than men's will (Williams, 2003).

According to Williams (2003), other incompetence biases are based on stereotypes. For example, men's social behavior at work is often seen as positive and work related (networking, bonding, mentoring). However, often when women engage in these practices, their behavior is evaluated based on commonly employed stereotypes, so that it is seen as gossiping and unprofessional. Additionally, women are frequently pigeon holed into particular subtypes, such as a princess or a mother, or are expected to adhere to traditionally feminine roles. The use of this type of stereotype negatively affects a woman's career by coloring her behaviors and decisions and by saddling the female employee with the negative baggage that accompanies these female subtypes (Williams). Moreover, by having to do the work associated with maintaining this stereotyped view (e.g. plan social events, be warm, likeable, and stroke men's egos), women are required to take time away from their substantive work, which only increases the pressure on women (Williams).

Finally, Williams (2003) subscribes attribution biases as well as polarized evaluations as accounting for incompetence-based glass ceiling discrimination. Attribution biases occur when women's successes are attributed to outside factors, such as luck, and her failures are attributed to personal shortcomings. As would be expected based on the biases already reviewed, men have the opposite attribution bias – their mistakes are seen as the result of an unlucky and temporary situational factor while their successes are viewed as evidence of their skill and ability.

One final issue for professional women is polarized evaluations. Polarized evaluations are particularly common in situations where very few individuals with a particular trait are employed. When women are in the minority, they are more likely to receive either highly favorable or highly critical evaluations despite their actual performance (Williams, 2003). In academia, where women are frequently a very small minority within their department, polarized evaluations are likely.

Being Punished for Being Too Competent

The biases working against women who are seen as overly competent are well known in the popular culture. For example, co-workers and subordinates often dislike women in superior positions, because their success is seen as incompatible with traditional female traits. Therefore, they are seen as ruthless, hostile, power-driven, and selfish (Williams, 2003). This stereotype is linked to the earlier discussed literature on biases against mothers (see the work-family section of this article). Williams also discusses the conflict reviewed in the "presentation" subsection of this paper – women who are seen as competent are typically not liked, and women who are liked are seen as incompetent.

Moreover, Williams (2003) writes that, while assertiveness in men is perceived as just that, in women, assertiveness is often seen as aggressive and therefore negative. Also, self-promotion in women is typically considered distasteful. While men who engage in this behavior are seen as confident and someone who knows what he is worth, women who self-promote are viewed as immodest, arrogant, and self-aggrandizing (Williams). Finally, Williams reviews how sexual harassment has frequently been used to derail successful women and to eliminate them as competitors.

Conclusion: Women's Struggle with the Current Promotion and Tenure System

The literature suggests that women in higher education are struggling due to cultural, institutional, political, and personal factors that make the already challenging tenure and promotion process significantly more difficult and qualitatively different for women than for men. The incompatibility between who women are and whom they are expected to be, between what women want and what they are offered, between the choices and sacrifices women are willing to make and those they are forced to make, and to what hard working women feel they are entitled and for what they are expected to settle explains, at least in part, why women continue to make up only a minority of tenured and full professors in academia. The next question is what should be done to combat this problem?

An article by Benschop and Brouns (2003) frames the question in terms of academic organization. The authors suggest that universities be viewed as "social institutions where gender is 'done' in a specific way" (Benschop & Brouns, p. 194), and one in which the very cultural, organizational, and institutional nature of the university must be recognized as one that privileges men. Forcing women to adapt and transform themselves to masculine ways of working, researching, knowing, and being has not worked.

Rather, the authors recommend that in order to attract and retain women's valuable experiences, viewpoints, and contributions, universities must make the necessary organizational changes in order to integrate and appreciate alternative ways of "doing gender" (Benschop & Brouns, 2003). Additionally, in a New York Times interview (Cohen, 2002), Williams has stated that an institutional and cultural change is

needed. Williams expressed that she believes that for mothers in particular, parenting must be integrated into the work culture if women are ever to achieve equality in the workplace (Cohen).

Other authors and organizations have offered specific ideas for how universities could change the institutional structure and climate. The APA's Taskforce on Women in Academia report (2000) makes eight recommendations for universities. These include (1) evaluating and making adjustments in departmental/institutional climate, (2) examining compensation to ensure equity, (3) ensuring that administrators are held accountable for gender equity issues, (4) supporting, mentoring and providing necessary accommodation for women in the area of teaching, (5) providing women with appropriate and equitable support for their research (6) recognizing and appreciating women's service contributions while ensuring that women are not unfairly encumbered by these responsibilities, (7) developing training materials for faculty and staff on gender equity issues, and (8) developing programs to address equity and under representation issues relevant to ethnic minorities.

Additionally, Erickson and Rodriquez (1999) believe that specific changes must be made at several levels including the administrative or university-wide level, the departmental level, the senior faculty/mentor level, and the junior faculty level. The authors have several suggestions including, but not limited to ensuring that administrators guarantee that hiring practices are both overtly and covertly nondiscriminatory, that alternatives to the traditional tenure track are offered (see Drago & Williams, 2000 for a discussion of a half-time tenure track proposal), and that the orientation/socialization process be formalized.

At the departmental level, Erickson and Rodriquez (1999) state, for example, that individualized orientations be offered, that new faculty be protected from being overloaded, and that new faculties' research interests be facilitated. Suggestions for senior faculty include demonstrating a personal interest in new faculty members, and becoming informed about special circumstances or needs of female faculty. Finally, junior faculty are strongly encouraged to find supportive and collegial networks and individuals within their departments as well as maintain good working relationship with their department head and collaborative relationships with other faculty within or outside their university (Erickson & Rodriquez, 1999).

These changes are needed for both universities and women academicians to thrive. Universities need these changes, because academia needs women's voices and ideas to continue to expand research domains and to ensure continuing academic integrity. Women need these changes to prevent academic disenfranchisement and professional marginalization. While these changes are necessary in other arenas as well, in particular, corporate boardrooms and law firms, it seems only appropriate that the institutions that pride themselves at being on the forefront of new ideas, new ways of thinking and seekers of truth set the precedent for true equity for women.

References

American Psychological Association Presidential Initiative on Work and Families.(2004). *Public policy, work, and families: The report of the APA presidential initiative on work and families.* Washington, DC: Author.

American Psychological Association Taskforce on Women in Academe. (2000). *Women In Academe: Two Steps Forward, One Step Back.* Washington, DC: Author.

Ancis, J. R., & Phillips, S. D. (1996). Academic gender bias and women's behavioral agency self-efficacy. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 75,* 131-137.

Barnett, R. C. (2004). Preface: Woman and work: Where are we, where did we come from, and where are we going? *Journal of Social Issues, 60,* 667-674.

Benschop, Y., & Brouns, M. (2003). Crumbling ivory towers: Academic organizing and its gender effects. *Gender, Work, and Organization, 10,* 194-212.

Bleske-Rechek, A., & Webb, R. M. (2002). Neglected aspects and unsupported claims. *American Psychologist, 57,* 1132-1133.

Bond, J. T., Thompson, C., Galinsky, E., & Prottas, D. (2002). *Highlights of the national study of the changing workforce executive summary* (Report No. 3). Washington, DC: Families and Work Institute.

Capaldi, E. D. (2004). Power, politics, and survival in academia. In J. M. Darley, M Zanna, & H. L. Roediger III (Eds.), *The Compleat Academic: A Career Guide* (pp. 245-257). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Caplan, P. J. (2003). Balancing career and family. In M. J. Prinstein & M. D. Patterson (Eds.), *The Portable Mentor: Expert Guide to a Successful Career in Psychology* (pp. 45-54). New York, NY: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers

Cohen, H. (2002, August 4). The baby bias. *The New York Times,* Education Life Section.

Crosby, F. J., Williams, J. C., & Biernat, M. (2004). The maternal wall. *Journal of Social Issues, 60,* 675-682.

Cuddy, A. J. C., Fiske, S .T., & Glick, P. (2004). When professionals become mothers, warmth doesn't cut the ice. *Journal of Social Issues, 60,* 701-718.

Curtis, J. W. (2004). Balancing work and family for faculty: Why it's important. [Electronic version]. *Academe, 90,* np. Retrieved March 5, 2005, from http://www.aaup.org/publications/Academe/2004/04nd/04ndcurtis.htm

Deutsch, F. M., & Saxon, S. E. (1998). The double standard of praise and criticism for mothers and fathers. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 22,* 665-683.

Drago, R., & Williams, J. (2000). A half-time tenure track proposal. *Change, November/December,* 47-51.

Dinerman, B. (1971). Sex discrimination in academia. *Journal of Higher Education, 42,* 253-264.

Eberspacher, J., & Sisler, G. (1988). Mentor relationships in academic administration. *Initiatives, 51,* 27-32.

Feldman, D. C. (1976). A contingency theory of socialization. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 21,* 433-452.

Fouad, N. A. & Carter, R. T. (1992). Gender and racial issues for new counseling psychologists in academia. *The Counseling Psychologist, 20,* 123-140.

Hackett, G., Betz, N. E., & Doty, M. S. (1985). The development of a taxonomy of career competencies for professional women. *Sex Roles, 12,* 393-409.

Halpern, D. (2004, November). Obstacles to female full professorship: Another civil - rights issue. *Monitor on Psychology, 35,* 5.

Halpert, J. A., Wilson, M. L, Hickman, J. L. (1993). Pregnancy as a source of bias in performance appraisals. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 14,* 1993).

Harris, M. J. (2002). Swinging pendulums. *American Psychologist, 57,* 1130-1131.

Heilman, M. E. (2001). Description and prescription: How gender stereotypes prevent women's ascent up the organizational ladder. *Journal of Social Issues, 57,* 657-674.

Kelloway, E. K., Gottlieb, B. H., & Barham, L. (1999). The source, nature, and direction of work and family conflict: A longitudinal investigation. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 4,* 337-346.

Kite, M. E., Russo, N. F., Brehm, S. S., Fouad, N. A., Iijima Hall, C. C., Hyde, J. S., & Keita, G. P. (2001). Women psychologists in academe: Mixed progresss, unwarranted complacency. *American Psychologist, 56,* 1080-1098.

Knights, D., & Richards, W. (2003). Sex discrimination in UK academia. *Gender, Work, and Organization, 10,* 213-238.

Knox, P. L., & McGovern, T. V. (1988). Mentoring women in academia. *Teaching Of Psychology, 15,* 39-41.

Lobel, S. (2004). Working part time after tenure. [Electronic version]. *Academe, 90,* np. Retrieved March 5, 2005, from http://www.aaup.org/publications/Academe/2004/04nd/04ndlobe.htm

Marwell, G., Rosenfeld, R. & Spilerman, S. (1979). Geographic constraints on women's careers in academia. *Science, 21,* 1225-1231.

Moyer, A., Salovey, P., & Casey-Cannon, S. (1999). Challenges facing female doctoral students and recent graduates. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 23,* 607-630.

Nelson & Burke (Eds.). (2002). *Gender, work stress, and health.* Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Nosek, B. A., Banaji, M. R., & Greenwald, A. G. (2002). Math = male, me = female, therefore math = me. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 83,* 44-59.

Park, D. C., & Nolen-Hoeksema, S. (2004). Women in academia. In J. M. Darley, M. P. Zanna, & H. L. Roediger III (Eds.), *The Compleat Academic: A Career Guide* (pp. 311-328). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association

Phillips, A., & Daniluk, J. C. (2004). Beyond "survivor": How childhood sexual abuse informs the identity of adult women at the end of the therapeutic process. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 82,* 177-184.

Quinn, K., Lane, S. E., & Olswang, S. G. (2004). Family-friendly policies and the research university. [Electronic version]. *Academe, 90,* np. Retrieved March 5, 2005, from http://www.aaup.org/publications/Academe/2004/04nd/04ndquin.htm

Rabasca, L. (2000, November). In search of equality: An APA task force recommends ways to ensure more equality for women in academe. *Monitor on Psychology, 31.*

Ridgeway, C. L., & Correll, S. J. (2004). Motherhood as a status characteristic. *Journal of Social Issues, 60,* 683-700.

Riemenschnieder, A., & Harper, K. V. (1990). Women in academia: Guilty or not guilty? Conflict between caregiving and employment. *Initiatives, 53,* 27-35.

Rooke, P. (1989). Re-ordering our partiality: Reflections on careerism and feminist commitment in academia. *The Journal of Educational Thought, 23,* 106-119.

Sherif, M., White, B. J., & Harvey, O. J. (1955). Status in experimentally produced groups. *American Journal of Sociology, 60,* 370-379.

Stewart, T. L., Berkvens, M., Engles, W. A. E. W., & Pass, J. A. (2003). Status and likability: Can the "mindful" woman have it all? *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 33,* 2040-2059.

Sullivan, B., Hollenshead, C., & Smith, G. (2004). Developing and implementing work - family policies for faculty. [Electronic version]. *Academe, 90,* np. Retrieved March 5, 2005, from http://www.aaup.org/publications/Academe/2004/04nd/04ndsull.htm

Takiff, H. A., Sanchez, D. T., & Stewart, T. L. (2001). What's in a name? The status implications of students' terms of address for male and female professors. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 25,* 134-144.

Ward, K., & Wolf-Wendel, L. (2004). Fear factor: How safe is it to make time for family? [Electronic version]. *Academe, 90,* np. Retrieved March 5, 2005, from http://www.aaup.org/publications/Academe/2004/04nd/04ndward.htm

Williams, J. C. (2000). *Unbending gender.* Oxford, London: Oxford University Press.

Williams, J. C. (2002). "It's snowing down south": How to help mothers and avoid recycling the sameness/difference debate. *Columbia University Law Review, 102,* 812-847.

Williams, J. C. (2004). Hitting the maternal wall. [Electronic version]. *Academe, 90,* np. Retrieved March 5, 2005, from http://www.aaup.org/publications/Academe/2004/04nd/04ndtoc.htm

Williams, J. C. (2005). The social psychology of stereotyping: Using social science to litigate gender discrimination cases and defang the "cluelessness" defense. *Employee Rights and Employment Policy Journal, 7,* 101-154.

Young, C. Y., & Wright, J. V. (2001). Mentoring: The components for success. *Journal of Instructional Psychology, 28,* 202-206.

CHAPTER 2

HAVING IT ALL? MOTHERS' EXPERIENCES AS ASSISTANT PROFESSORS IN COUNSELING PSYCHOLOGY ACADEMIA

Women have made great strides with regard to their participation in the field of psychology. Currently, women earn significantly more of the Ph.D.s in every area of the field except for cognitive and psycholinguistics and psychometrics and quantitative (American Psychological Association (APA) Taskforce on Women in Academe, 2000). In 2001, 71.4% of all Ph.D.s in Psychology were earned by women (APA Online Center for Psychology Workforce Analysis and Research, 2003a).

Certain subfields of psychology, including counseling psychology, can boast about the success of women in their doctoral programs, as women earn significantly more Ph.D.s than men in the field of counseling psychology annually. National data from 1996 demonstrates that while 303 Ph.D.s were awarded to women during that year, only 161 were awarded to men. This makes counseling psychology one of the most female dominated subfields in psychology (APA Task Force on Women in Academe, 2000).

Despite women earning a significant majority of the doctorates, counseling psychology academic departments are "bottom-heavy" when it comes to female faculty (Kite, et al., 2001, Rabasca, 2000). Women made up 43% of all counseling psychology professors in departments awarding doctoral degrees. However, females comprised more than half of the assistant professor positions in these departments (57.5%). At the same time, women only accounted for 48.5% of associate professors and only 25% of full

professors (APA Taskforce on Women in Academe, 2000). These statistics reflect the larger trend in the field of psychology with women comprising 58% of non-tenure track, 50% of tenure track, and 30% of tenured faculty in graduate psychology departments in the United States (APA Online Center for Psychology Workforce Analysis and Research, 2003b).

The causes of this gender disparity are not well understood as there is little empirical research on this topic. The related theoretical literature suggests there are gender attributable reasons why women, even when they quantifiably dominate a field, fail to achieve equal stature in higher education. University and departmental culture and climate, work – family conflict, and overt and covert sex discrimination are three themes culled from the literature that potentially explain women's stalled advancement. Each of the themes and their subparts are examined briefly in the following sections.

Culture and Climate

One factor limiting women's advancement in academia is the highly entrenched, traditionally patriarchal culture of the academy (Rabasca, 2000). While universities have accepted women into their professorial ranks, they require women to adapt to the rules, procedures, and cultural milieu already in place. A 1993 National Center on Educational Statistics (NCES) national survey demonstrates that the "add women and stir" approach is not working. NCES reported the existence of women's felt inequity as 40% of women psychology faculty surveyed disagreed with the statement "Female faculty members are treated fairly at this institution" [referring to their own university] (NCES, 1993). Examples of how the climate and cultural values continue to make it difficult for women to succeed in the academy are discussed below.

Departmental Socialization

Departmental socialization is an extensive and continuous process that includes both personal and professional tasks. New psychology professors of both genders undertake this taxing process, including anticipatory tasks (expectations and perceptions of the new organization prior to beginning work), accommodation tasks (developing role clarity, establishing collegial relationships, mastery of work related tasks, understanding the organization), and role management (managing conflicts between personal and professional life, professional politics, and setting boundaries on work responsibilities) (Feldman, 1976; Fouad & Carter, 1992). Successful departmental socialization is believed essential for establishing a professional identity and for fully developing one's career (Eberspacher & Sisler, 1988).

Fouad and Carter (1992) assert that for the female professor, the socialization process has additional challenges. For example, the unstructured and informal socialization process found in most universities may lead women to feel isolated and unsupported. These feelings are likely compounded due to the preponderance of male faculty and the patriarchal culture that pervades (Fouad & Carter; Kite et al., 2001). Moreover, new professors must also have career advancement skills such as comfort with taking risks, the ability to safeguard rights, prioritizing one's career above all else, and being competent at creating opportunities for oneself (Fouad & Carter).

Many academic women have difficulty with these skills due to internalized messages and explicit feedback about appropriate behavior for women (i.e. women should be accommodating and helpful), concerns about self presentation, (i.e. appearing competent and committed) difficulties with assertiveness (i.e. prioritizing one's own

work and saying no to student or faculty requests), and/or a lack of support from within, or outside of, the department (i.e. isolation from support systems, particularly those that are informal) (Fouad & Carter, 1992).

Mentorship

The lack of appropriate and effective mentorship also impacts junior female professors' ability to succeed as mentorship is critical to departmental and career acclimation and to providing new professors emotional, intellectual, and practical support (Eberspacher & Sisler, 1988; Fouad & Carter, 1992). Women in particular are looking for their mentors to be professionally and emotionally available and supportive (Knox & McGovern, 1988).

Research evidences that individuals are significantly more likely to enter a mentoring relationship with an individual of the same gender (Eberspacher & Sisler, 1988; Fouad & Carter, 1992). The mentor-protégé relationship is also one that is, by its very nature, a disproportionate allocation of power (Young & Wright, 2001). These power issues are potentially exacerbated in situations when the majority of the senior faculty are male and the mentor subscribes to the dominant, patriarchal culture in the department and the university. (Capaldi, 2004; Knox & McGovern, 1988). Like most other academic fields, senior female faculty in counseling psychology are in short supply. Therefore, mentors, who understand the issues and challenges unique to female faculty, and have the character traits desired by the female junior professors, are not readily available (Fouad & Carter, 1992).

Work/Family Conflict

Role overload and role conflict, the inflexible institutional demands of many universities, and the overlap of the tenure and reproductive timelines may stifle academic women's careers (see APA Presidential Initiative on Work and Family, 2004; Halpern, 2004). Women continue to bear the primary responsibility for caregiving and household tasks (APA Task Force on Women in Academe, 2000; APA Presidential Initiative on Work and Family; Fouad & Carter, 1992; Halpern; Park & Nolen-Hoeksema, 2004; Riemenschinieder & Harper, 1990). The work/family conflict affects both men and women (Kelloway, Gottlieb, & Barham, 1999). However, the disproportionate burden on women makes it extremely difficult for women who choose to have children to give their careers the same prioritization as their male counterparts (Caplan, 2003).

It also requires many women to develop sophisticated coping strategies to manage all of their demands (Caplan 2003; Fouad & Carter, 1992). Moreover, heterosexual women with Ph.D.s are typically married to men who also have advanced degrees while the same is not true of the spouses of men with Ph.D.s. The pressure of balancing two demanding careers and the likely restriction on geographic freedom are burdens often unique to women (Marwell, Rosenfeld, & Spilerman, 1979).

Do Babies Make A Difference?

Mason and Goulden's articles (2002; 2004), state the most important indicator of whether a woman will achieve tenure is her decision to have children. In the 2002 article, Mason and Goulden compare women's bottom-heavy and men's top-heavy presence in academia. A substantial proportion of the variance between males and females achieving tenure is accounted for by whether academic women have babies, particularly within the

first five years of their career. For those having "early babies" the tenure gap between women and men in the social sciences is approximately 20% (Mason & Goulden, 2002). By contrast, men who have early babies achieve tenure at a higher rate than individuals of either gender who do not have children early in their careers (Mason & Goulden, 2002).

Women who delay childbirth until post-tenure are often left childless. When asked, thirty-eight percent of female respondents stated they were unable to have as many children as they would have liked (Mason & Goulden, 2004). Moreover, tenured women are much more likely to be single, divorced or separated than their male counterparts (Mason & Goulden, 2004). These studies demonstrate that women's "choices" often include forfeiting motherhood, sacrificing their relationships with their partners, outsourcing their child's care, and/or career or economic marginalization (Cohen, 2004, Curtis, 2004, Williams, 2000, Williams, 2002, Williams, 2005).

The Maternal Wall, the "Good Mother" the "Ideal Worker"

The maternal wall has its roots in archaic notions about women (see Barnett, 2004 for a thorough historical explanation of the maternal wall) and continues to thrive due to two cultural myths – the "good mother" and the "ideal worker". The "good mother" myth holds that women are uniquely capable to care for children and that children's well-being is dependent upon being cared for full-time by their mothers (Barnett, 2004). Working mothers who do not subscribe to this myth may be penalized and stigmatized covertly or overtly by their co-workers, employers, and the larger society (Barnett; Bond, Thompson, Galinsky, & Prottas, 2002; Crosby et al., 2004; Cuddy, Fiske, & Glick, 2004; Deutsch & Saxon, 1998; Ridgeway & Correll, 2004). They are often assumed to be incompetent employees (Cuddy, Fiske, & Glick) and are frequently the recipients of benevolent

stereotyping (telling mothers what is appropriate based on good intentions) (Williams, 2005). Women are also subjected to role incongruity (the belief that one cannot be a good mother and a good employee or that a particular job is not appropriate for a mother), and attribution bias (the belief that whenever a woman is not in the office, she is with her children rather than working) (Williams, 2005).

The ideal worker is one who begins working in his early twenties, is completely dedicated to his career, works full time throughout his career, takes no time off for childbearing or child rearing, and remains in the same line of employment until his retirement in his early to mid-sixties (Crosby, et al, 2004). Universities consistently promote and maintain the ideal worker myth and mentality as demonstrated by the reluctance by these institutions to accommodate diverse needs by providing a range of family friendly policies. Universities also promote the ideal worker myth by failing to reward nontraditional contributions such as mentoring students and service commitments, and continuing to promote the quantity of publications as the primary indicator of tenure worthiness (APA, 2000; Lobel, 2004; Quinn, Lange, & Olswang, 2004; Sullivan, Hollenshead, & Smith, 2004).

Due to the pervasiveness of the ideal worker mentality, academic women must accommodate the rules established by the needs, preferences, and beliefs of their patriarchal institutions regardless of their circumstances and responsibilities (Crosby et al., 2004, Nelson & Burke, 2002). Maintaining this rigorous lifestyle leads to work-family conflict, stress, and decreased coping resources, which can have a deleterious effect on both a woman's work and family life (Kelloway, et al., 1999). Universities'

adherence to the ideal worker myth ensures that there is only one "right" way to succeed in academia.

The maternal wall's covert presence has a highly damaging effect on women's careers, particularly when the women are well educated and the careers are prestigious (Barnett, 2004; Crosby, et al., 2004; Cuddy, et al., 2004; Deutsch & Saxon, 1998; Families and Work Institute, 2002; Nelson & Burke, 2002; Ridgeway & Correll, 2004). Due to motherhood's diminished social status, (attributed to a specific conflict between the "good mother" and the "ideal worker" myths) evaluations of a mother's workplace performance, competence, commitment, and employment/promotion desirability, are likely to plummet regardless of her previous employment evaluations or her actual post-motherhood performance (Cuddy, et al.; Halpert, Wilson, & Hickman, 1993). Men who have children do not experience this outcome (Cuddy, et al.).

Family-Friendly Policy Implementation and Faculty Participation

Many universities recognize academic mothers' challenges and have implemented various family-friendly policies (Sullivan et al., 2004). However, faculty often do not take advantage of these policies due to inadequate policies, financial need, fear of career retribution, negative perceptions, poor communication and dissemination of information about the policies and lack of centralized, university wide policy implementation. Inadequate data collection also makes it impossible to evaluate the effectiveness of the policies (Quinn et al., 2004.; Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2004).

Gender Discrimination

In order to be professionally successful, women often must overcome overt and covert gender discrimination in the form of stereotypes, and discriminatory policies,

practices and cultures. (Dinerman, 1971; Knights & Richards, 2003; Ridgeway & Correll, 2004; Williams, 2005). For example, female academicians must frequently relinquish gender socialized traits with which they are comfortable, such as providing emotional support and mentoring for others because these tasks are not highly valued in the race for tenure. Similarly, women must prevent others from subtly exploiting their willingness to be accommodating and nurturing (Hackett, Betz, & Doty, 1985; Kite, et al., 2001; Park & Nolen-Hoeksema, 2004; Rooke, 1989). Finally, women are frequently required to abandon their research passions, methodologies and epistemologies in exchange for more traditionally acceptable and respectable lines of inquiry (Rooke; Williams, 2004, see also, *The Compleat Academic: A Career Guide 4th ed.*, Park & Nolen-Hoeksema, 2004 for a thorough description of the contradictory and impossible standards that academic women are expected to achieve).

Furthermore, many female academicians must overcome biases that make it difficult for them to prove their competence (assumption of incompetence, leniency bias, recall bias, attribution bias, gendered stereotypes, polarized evaluations) (see Sherif, White, Harvey, 1955; Williams, 2005 for complete explanations of these phenomena). Similarly, women are frequently caught in the double bind of trying to be both respected and liked. Women who present as typically feminine through their warmth, friendliness, accommodating tendencies, and nurturing are often considered appropriate for hiring but are not perceived as overly competent (Williams, 2003).

Women are also punished, subtly or overtly for possessing too much competence (Williams, 2005). Typically this manifests when co-workers and subordinates dislike women in superior positions. Their success is seen as incompatible with traditional

female traits, and they are seen as ruthless, hostile, power-driven, and selfish (Williams, 2003). Moreover, assertiveness in women is often seen as aggressive and therefore negative. Also, self-promotion in women is typically considered distasteful and women who self-promote are viewed as immodest, arrogant, and self-aggrandizing (Williams, 2003). These women will often not be hired or advanced, despite their perceived competence because they are not seen as influential or likable (Williams, 2003). Finally, subtle and overt sexual harassment may be used to derail successful women and eliminate them as competitors.

The Current Study

As stated above, there is limited empirical research exploring why women have been unable to close the tenure and promotion gap at United States research universities in most areas of study including counseling psychology. The current study is designed to begin to fill this gap in the literature.

Counseling psychology mirrors the bottom-heavy nature of women's participation in most academic departments despite women's significantly higher participation as doctoral students, clinicians, and assistant professors in this field. Moreover, the field of counseling psychology purports to be the subset of psychology that pays special attention to diversity issues as well as focusing on individuals' strengths and adaptive abilities. Yet the data on women in the field suggest that there may be a discrepancy between the stated priorities of counseling psychology and the reality of the experiences of women academicians in the field. This potential inconsistency warrants investigation.

The participants in this study are all female assistant professors at American Psychological Association (APA) accredited counseling psychology doctoral programs in

the United States. Additionally, all of the women in the study are mothers. The study's participants were limited to women with children in order to capture the full range of issues that the theoretical literature suggests are limiting women's advancement.

This study attempts to determine what factors are causing the continuing gender gap in rates of tenure and promotion for women academics in counseling psychology? Moreover, this study also provides a forum for female assistant professors to voice their concerns, struggles, achievements and recommendations so as to allow for a better understanding of the subjective experiences of these academicians. This qualitative study also allows inferences to be drawn about the validity of the theoretical literature and will provide directions for future research.

Method

Participants

A review of all APA approved counseling psychology program websites revealed that there are fewer than one hundred female assistant professors at such programs. Moreover, only a percentage of this group has minor children. Therefore, extensive demographic information may make it easy for participants to be identified. Additionally, this is a sensitive research topic with potentially important ramifications on the participants' careers and lives. Due to these factors, only limited demographic information will be provided about the participants in this study in order to ensure their confidentiality.

Participants included 11 female assistant professors. Ten of the participants are professors in counseling psychology. The eleventh participant's interview was excluded from the study because it was revealed during the interview that the participant was

trained in a mental health field other than counseling psychology, and that she is not employed in a counseling psychology department. The remaining ten participants' departments all have doctoral programs that are approved by the American Psychological Association. At the time of the initial interview, nine participants had worked in their departments for at least two years and had not yet begun the process of application for tenure. The tenth participant had initiated the process but had not been apprised of her initial tenure status at the time of her interview. The floor of two years for the assistant professors was necessary in order to eliminate professors who were so new to the profession that they would not have an adequate understanding of the complexities of the job and the possible impact on their lives. The ceiling on seniority was required to prevent participation from women who had already achieved tenure status.

The participants all had at least one child under the age of 18 years living at home. Eight of the participants were mothers of very young children under the age of five. One participant was the mother of elementary school age children, and one participant was the mother of adolescent children. As discussed above, the literature suggests that for women, having children prior to achieving tenure is a significant inhibitor to achieving tenure and promotion. Therefore, motherhood was required for participation in order to adequately capture themes and issues related to women's attempts to balance work and parenting responsibilities.

Guiding Theories

A qualitative approach was chosen because it allows for a thorough, in-depth exploration of the issues found in the literature that a quantitative approach may not capture. Moreover, due to the unique experiences of women in academia, a feminist

approach was essential to this study. Feminism stresses an egalitarian relationship between researcher and participant with an emphasis on disavowing women's traditional absence and invisibility from many aspects of society. Feminism also promotes women's ways of knowing (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003; Giorgi, 1997; Olesen, 1994, Phillips & Daniluk, 2004). Given the subject matter, feminism seems particularly relevant.

A constructivist grounded theory approach was employed as the guiding theory for the data analysis and the coding process. This approach was chosen because it encourages rigor through both its emergent theme development and through its two-step coding process (Charmaz, 2000). Grounded theory also avoids positivism by stressing the role that both the researcher and the participant play in the creation of knowledge and by emphasizing a social constructive and consensual process in the data analysis (Charmaz; Hill, Thompson, & Williams, 1997).

Phenomenology was emphasized, both as a foundation of grounded theory and because it allows the researcher to delve into individual's experiences in particular situations without assuming or imputing knowledge about the occurrences or the meaning they hold for the research participants (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003). Phenomenology is also an appropriate method to investigate a subject about which little is known as is the case with this study (Phillips & Daniluk, 2004).

Data Sources

A structured interview protocol was designed for use in individual interviews. The questions were constructed based on the information found in the literature. They were also designed to emphasize some of the key principles of feminist philosophy. These include egalitarianism between researcher and participant and giving credence both to

participants' individual experiences as assistant professors and their beliefs about the larger construct of women in counseling psychology academia. The initial questions asked participants how they feel generally about being a female counseling psychology professor ("What is your overall experience like as an assistant professor"; "The data suggests women are having a hard time closing the tenure and promotion gap. What are your thoughts?") (APA Presidential Initiative on Women and Family, 2004, APA Taskforce on Women in Academe, 2000);

These general questions were asked to allow participants to respond with which ever issues were most salient to them. This gave the interviewer information about how to direct or change the focus of the interview if necessary. The final two questions asked participants for their recommendations for women ("What are your recommendations for women in the field?") and for universities ("What are your recommendations for universities?"). These questions were included to again underscore feminist principles. The questions give the participants "buy-in" into the study by allowing their voices to potentially influence the decisions made by women entering the field and the future direction of counseling psychology and academia.

The remaining questions touched primarily on four topics, all drawn from the relevant literature. The four topics included: departmental culture and climate (APA Presidential Initiative on Work & Family, 2004; APA Taskforce on Women in Academe, 2000; NCES, 1993; Rabasca, 2000), mentorship (Capaldi, 2004; Eberspacher& Sisler, 1988; Fouad & Carter, 1992; Knox & McGovern, 1988; Young & Wright, 2001), children and work family conflict (APA Presidential Initiative on Work & Family, 2004; Halpern, 2004), and gender discrimination (Williams, 2003, 2005).

Each question addressed a more specific element of the broader topic. For example, the departmental culture and climate theme included questions pertaining to departmental socialization ("What impact did the departmental climate have on your assimilation into the group?") (Eberspacher & Sisler, 1988; Fouad & Carter, 1988; Kite, 2001), and self-presentation ("Have you ever felt there has been a conflict between being respected and being liked for you personally or for women generally?") (Hackett, Betz & Doty, 1985; Kite, 2001; Park & Nolan-Hoeksema, 2004; Rooke, 1989; Williams, 2004).

The second topic included two questions on mentorship ("Do you have a mentor? How did that relationship affect you personally and/or professionally") (Capaldi, 2004; Eberspacher& Sisler, 1988; Fouad & Carter, 1992; Knox & McGovern, 1988; Young & Wright, 2001).

The third topic, children and work-family conflict, included multiple questions. First, inquiry was made about children's impact on managing work responsibilities and achieving tenure and promotion ("What was it like balancing work and family a) before babies b) after babies?"; "Some research suggests that the most important indicator of whether a woman will succeed in academia is whether she has children – how do you feel about this?") (Caplan, 2003; Mason & Goulden, 2002, 2004). The second question was added to the initial interview protocol after two interviews had been conducted because the data from the initial interviews suggested that this question was needed in order to sufficiently tap into the specific issue of work/family conflict. Adding this question was in keeping with the constructivist grounded theory method, as the principal investigator used the initial analysis of the data from the first two interviews to inform and improve

the data collection process for the remaining interviews (Charmaz, 2000; Ponterotto, 2005). The first two women were asked this question during their follow up interview.

The children and work/family conflict topics also included questions on institutional and departmental support and leave policies, ("In the literature, I read that many individuals are afraid to take advantage of family friendly policies at their universities. What was your experience?"; "What are your feelings about the adequacy of university family friendly policies") (Lobel, 2004; Quinn et al., 2004; Sullivan et al., 2004; Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2004) and the maternal wall and the ideal worker myths ("What were your experiences with the maternal wall?") (APA Taskforce on Women in Academe, 2000; Barnett, 2004; Bond, Thompson, Galinsky, & Drottas, 2002; Crosby et al., 2004; Cuddy, Fiske & Glick, 2004; Deutsch & Saxon, 1998; Lobel, 2004; Quinn, Lange & Olswang, 2004; Ridgeway & Correll, 2004; Sullivan, Hollenshead & Smith, 2004). A standard explanation, drawn from the relevant literature, of the maternal wall and ideal worker concepts were provided for each participant.

Finally, participants were asked if they have experienced any forms of covert or overt discrimination in their professional lives ("Have you ever experienced either overt or covert sexual discrimination in your professional life?"; "What are your experiences with the glass ceiling?"; "Do you feel you have to work harder to prove your competence? Do you feel penalized for being too competent?") (Dinerman, 1971; Knights & Richards, 2003; Ridgeway & Correll, 2004; Williams, 2003, 2005).

The Research Team

The research team consisted of five members. The principle investigator is a female doctoral student in counseling psychology. The study was conducted as her

dissertation which partially fulfilled the requirements for a Ph.D. in counseling psychology. The principle investigator is in her early 30's and is a mother of two small children.

Additionally, the research team was made up of three research assistants. The first research assistant who participated in transcribing the interviews, is a male master's student in professional counseling. He is married but has no children. The second research assistant, who worked on the "blind" coding portion of the data analysis and was instrumental in developing the code book for the study is a female doctoral student in counseling psychology. She is in her mid-30's, is married and is the mother of two small children. The other two research assistants, who participated in the confirmatory coding process are female master's students in school psychology. The are both unmarried and have no children.

Finally, the research team was supervised by the principle investigator's dissertation chair who is the chairperson of the department in which all of the research team are students. The dissertation chair is a female, tenured, faculty member and full professor who is the mother of one adult child. The research team attempted to overcome its potential biases through use of a rigorous study design that had multiple layers of bias checks and by using a grounded theory approach which required the research team to continuously scrutinize the data to ensure that the research team was not imposing its own assumptions on the data. These processes are described in greater detail later in this section.

Procedure

Multiple recruitment methods were employed to elicit participation. These methods were decided upon with consultation and input from the principal investigator's dissertation committee as well as reliance on qualitative expertise found in publications (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003). First, flyers were handed out at the 2005 American Psychological Convention in Washington, D.C. to many counseling psychologists, particularly those who were female and identified themselves as assistant professors. Flyers were also given to other individuals who identified as having contact with women who met the criteria for participation. This technique did not elicit any participants.

The second recruitment technique was to email all of the counseling psychology program directors in the United States with a brief description of the study and the criteria for participation. Program directors were asked to alert any faculty members in their department who may meet the criteria. Interested participants were asked to contact the principal investigator for further information. Again, no participants were recruited using this method. The third, unsuccessful, recruitment method was to post a description of the study with the principal investigator's contact information to the APA Division 17 Society for the Advancement of Women listserv.

Finally, the principal investigator obtained a list of all APA approved counseling psychology programs in the United States from the APA website (Counseling psychology programs approved by the APA, 2005). The principal investigator then visited all of the websites affiliated with these programs and recorded the email contact information for all female assistant professors in these departments. A standardized email was then sent to each of these women describing the study, the participation criteria, and asking potential

participants to contact the principal investigator through email if they were interested in participating. Fifteen women, who fit the criteria, expressed interest in participating. From these fifteen women, eleven were actually interviewed. Interviewing ended once saturation was reached. Saturation was determined when it was felt that there were "diminishing returns" – that is, the information being heard in the interviews was becoming redundant (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003). While saturation was reached for the large domains and the broader sub-themes, saturation was not always achieved at the secondary sub-theme level. However, it was felt important to include this level of specificity in the results section so as to insure that individual voices were heard.

The principal investigator and the interviewee used email to establish a mutually agreeable date and time for the interview. Informed consent forms were faxed to the participant and then faxed back to the principal investigator prior to the interview. All participants were interviewed by telephone for approximately 60-90 minutes. All interviews were audiotaped. At the end of the initial interview, participants were asked if they would be willing to participate in a brief follow-up interview once the interviews had been transcribed. Every participant agreed to the follow-up interview. Transcription of the interviews was conducted by the principal investigator and a male research assistant, who is a master's student in professional counseling.

Data Analysis

Once the transcription process was complete, the principle investigator conducted an initial review of the data. This review consisted of summarizing the content of each interview and generating a summary sheet so as to efficiently scrutinize the content of each interview with each participant. The summary sheets for each of the follow-up

interviews listed both the individual participant's subject matter and the unique subject matter stated by the other women that was not mentioned by the participant in question. This step in the data analysis is consistent with the grounded theory approach of emergent data analysis (Charmaz, 2000).

The principal investigator scheduled follow-up interviews with the participants as a way to both incorporate feminist, qualitative philosophy (Olesen, 1994) and to help ensure the accuracy of the data (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Seven of the ten participants scheduled and participated in the follow-up interviews. One of the remaining participants never responded to the emails requesting participation, one of the participants responded to the email too late for participation, and one of the participant's contact information was no longer accurate.

The individual follow-up interviews lasted approximately 30 minutes and were audiotaped. The principal investigator first reviewed the participant's summary information, giving the women an opportunity to confirm, deny, or elaborate upon the material extracted from their interview.

Once this process was complete, the principal investigator shared the complementary data mentioned by other participants. This was done to allow each participant insight into some of the issues and experiences expressed by her peers and to give each woman the opportunity to comment on issues that they may have neglected to verbalize during their initial interview. Moreover, allowing each woman the chance to collaborate in this way was done to stress the feminist principles of egalitarianism between researcher and participant and to give voice to the participants' thoughts and feelings (Olesen, 2000). Triangulation of the data was achieved primarily through these

confirmatory, member-checking interviews, emersion in the literature, and bias checks through researcher group consensus in the preliminary (blind) and confirmatory coding processes which is described below (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000; Hill et al., 1997).

Coding

A feminist approach and a grounded theory approach guided the coding process (Charmaz, 2000; Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Strauss & Corbin, 1998) and took place in three distinct stages. As described above, feminism was incorporated into the data analysis in the initial stage which was conducted by the principal investigator and the interviewees during the follow-up interviews (Olesen, 2000). The second stage of the process was conducted by the principal investigator, and a research assistant who is a female doctoral student in counseling psychology. The two initial coders conducted a "blind," line-by-line coding process (Charmaz), in which each coder individually assessed each transcript and developed themes. After every two transcripts were evaluated, the coders would discuss their annotations in person or over the telephone. This initial analysis was conducted to ensure that the data were not contaminated by the principal investigator's biases. This process also ensured that the codes remained "active" so that modifications could be made to the codes in light of ongoing comparisons of intra- (i.e. themes discussed by the same participant in the same interview in different locations) and inter-interview (similar themes discussed by different participants) data (Charmaz).

After consensus was reached through this social construction procedure (Charmaz, 2000; Hill et al., 1997; Hill et al., 2005; Ponterotto, 2005), the coders began to construct a common code book. The coders then used the common code book to individually recode the two transcripts in order to eliminate bias, allow the researchers to

continue an active analysis process with the data and continue to ask questions of the data in order to ensure that it was being understood with sufficient complexity and sophistication (Charmaz). The initial coders then met again and compared codes throughout each transcript to establish an inter-rater reliability estimate. The process was then repeated with the next two transcripts and so on until all ten of the transcripts were coded and all emerging themes were included in the code book. The completed code book consisted of six broad categories, each one containing many sublevels to capture all of the themes discussed by the participants. Throughout this stage of the coding process emphasis was placed on ensuring that the participants' subjective experiences were captured in the codes rather than imposing objectivity on the data (Charmaz).

The third stage of the coding was a confirmatory process to ensure that no cross contamination bias existed from the first and second rounds of coding (Charmaz, 2000; Hill et al., 2005). Two other research assistants, both female school psychology graduate students, were given the transcripts and the completed code book. Both confirmatory coders were asked to use the code book to ascertain and label themes in the transcripts. If initial inter-rater reliability estimates between the principle investigator and the confirmatory coders were below 70%, the principle investigator met with the research assistants to attempt to ascertain discrepancies and achieve consensus on the appropriate codes for the data. An additional inter-rater reliability estimate was then determined with each of the confirmatory coders.

Results

The overall inter-rater reliability estimate of 81% was derived by finding the mean inter-rater reliability for each transcript (by averaging the inter-rater reliability

estimates that resulted from comparing the PI's coding with the coding of the three research assistants) and then finding the overall mean across all ten transcripts. The mean inter-rater reliability estimate for each transcript is as follows: transcript 1 (79%), transcript 2 (96%), transcript 3 (78%), transcript 4 (80%), transcript 5 (77%), transcript 6 (80%), transcript 7 (80%), transcript 8 (84%), transcript 9 (78%), and transcript 10 (82%). As Stemler (2004) states, inter-rater reliability estimates should be 70% or greater. Therefore, consensus estimates for these transcripts are sufficient to demonstrate trustworthiness, quality and rigor (Golafshami, 2003; Stemler, 2004).

Domains and Themes

Analysis of the data revealed six domains (Culture, Mentorship, Work-Family Conflict, Gender Discrimination/Harassment, Intrapersonal dynamics, and Recommendations). All ten participants were represented in five of the six domains. The gender discrimination/harassment domain had an n=9 as one participant denied experiencing any type of sexual discrimination or harassment.

The six domains were further broken down into primary and secondary themes (see Table 1). A domain or theme was considered general if it applied to every case, typical if found in at least half but not all cases, and variant if found in less than half, but more than one case (Hill et al., 1997).

Culture

The "culture" domain describes the milieu in which the female academician operates. The first theme in this domain is that of the academy generally and/or the university where the participant is employed. This theme and the sub-themes attempt to capture the participant's perceptions of and experiences in their field. Some participants

stated that they value their role as academics and feel privileged to be a part of the academy. Many of the women said that they feel supported by their colleagues, greatly enjoy working with students, and/or felt that the culture of their department was warm and welcoming. For example, one woman stated:

> I love what I'm doing; I feel that it's an honor to be in academia and to have this opportunity. I love the teaching, love the research, um don't mind the service too much – some is exciting and other is not but that's ok. I like the training, I feel very fortunate that I am in a very supportive environment and my colleagues have been more than, have given quite a bit of mentoring to me both formal and informal and a lot of support around the way that I'm trying to manage being an assistant professor as well as having a life and being a mom and so forth.

More than half of the women did not have as positive an experience and felt that the support they received was "mixed." None of the participants were overtly negative about their overall experience in academia or felt that the culture of their universities, departments, or academia generally was intolerable or overly hostile.

Despite these relatively positive statements, most of the women conveyed some difficulties experienced as a result of the academy's culture. A number of these difficulties result from issues inherent in the way the academic system is structured and are likely to affect assistant professors similarly regardless of gender. For example, all of the participants stated that the pressure of tenure demands, the expectations for research productivity, the ubiquitous nature of the job, and the prevalence of a workaholic mentality were commonplace at their universities and in their departments. Even though these issues may affect males as well as female, many of the participants still felt that as women with children, their experience is different primarily because:

> when I look around at my colleagues and the activities that they engage in and the process of applying you know applying for tenure and promotion, I find that they have – support kind of a workaholic you know approach – um you know lots of.

Table 1
Domains, Themes and Frequencies of Participant Responses

Domains and Themes	General	Typical	Variant
I. Culture	**X**		
Academia/University	X		
Tenure demands/workaholic mentality	X		
University politics			X
Supports people in tenure process			X
Likes job		X	
Mothers perceived differently		X	
Sink or Swim			X
Faculty	X		
Patriarchal (competitive, individualistic, aggressive, egos)		X	
Collegial			X
Faculty offers mixed support		X	
Welcoming/friendly		X	
Family friendly		X	
Supports double bind between respect and liked		X	
Question commitment if faculty member deviates from status quo			X
Relationship challenges w/ colleagues due to being female in a male dominated department		X	
Students and Female Assistant Professors	X		
Power Struggles/difficulty enforcing boundaries			X
Develop classroom reputation for stringency more easily			X
Enjoy students		X	
Students challenge competence/authority			X
More emotionally intimate relationship than male faculty		X	
Staff			
Female professors perceived and treated differently			X
II. Mentorship	**X**		
Informal		X	
Female academics with children			X
Colleagues generally			X
Graduate School Advisor			X
Formal		X	
Pretense			X
Helpful			X
Unhelpful/bad advice			X

Table 1 con't
Domains, Themes and Frequencies of Participant Responses

Domains and Themes	General	Typical	Variant
Mentorship con't			
None			X
Disillusion of previous mentoring relationship			X
Results in negative experience (intimidating, isolating)			X
Due to difference in treatment by faculty b/c o f gender			X
Acts as mentor/role model for others			X
III. Work/Family Conflict	**X**		
Multiple Role Strain	X		
Competing demands	X		
Clock overlap (biological, tenure)		X	
Flexibility not an option for mothers		X	
Support	X		
Inadequate support from colleagues		X	
Department attempts to support	X		
Inadequacy of family friendly policies		X	
No/poor maternity leave options		X	
Penalized for taking maternity leave			X
Administration lacks knowledge about leave policies			X
Policies that exist are inadequately utilized			X
No/poor financial support			X
No part time options			X
Leave not guaranteed (must petition/win leave)			X
Adequacy of family friendly policies			X
Childcare			
Availability		X	
Proximity			X
Cost			X
Romantic Partner		**X**	
Romantic Partner also in Academia			X
Positive			X
Negative			X
Relationship Strain			
Negotiation of responsibility/schedule juggling			X

Table 1 con't
Domains, Themes and Frequencies of Participant Responses

Domains and Themes	General	Typical	Variant
Work Family Conflict Con't.			
Geographical Considerations			X
Romantic Partner Supportive			X
Gender differences in parenting		X	
Women have second shift/male privilege		X	
Breastfeeding demands			X
IV. Gender Discrimination/Harassment	X		
Covert		X	
Departmental gender role stereotyping			X
Women's research not valued			X
Unique departmental contributions not valued toward tenure		X	
Colleagues impose own values about motherhood			X
Perceptions of seniority/competence			X
Subtle disapproval of maternity leave			X
Traditionally feminine personality traits exploited			X
Culture values/emphasized physical appearance			X`
Overt		X	
Misogynistic/Anti-pregnancy/family comments			X
Colleagues dismissive of thoughts/feelings due to gender			X
Inequitable pay			X
Glass Ceiling		X	
Have observed limits on other's careers			X
Have not yet experienced due to junior status			X
Self-imposed due to incompatibility of career & family demands		X	
V. Intrapersonal dynamics	**X**		
Internalization of societal messages	X		
"Good Mother"			X
"Ideal Worker"			X
"Superwoman"	X		
"Ability to accelerate off 'mommy track'"			X
Emotional Factors			
Chronic stress			X
Worry			X
Guilt			X

Table 1 con't
Domains, Themes and Frequencies of Participant Responses

Domains and Themes	General	Typical	Variant
Intrapersonal Dynamics con't			
Emotional Factors con't			
Ambivalence			X
Insecurity about ability to succeed			X
Difficulty with Assertiveness		X	
Setting boundaries/saying no		X	
Negotiating pay			X
Negative feedback from faculty when assertive			X
Due to internalization of traditional gender traits			X
Conduct self outside of comfort zone by adopting traditionally male trains			X
VI. Recommendations	**X**		
For Women	X		
Provide and Seek Mentoring/Social Support		X	
Clarify own values/priorities/boundaries		X	
Understand your department's priorities/Goodness of fit		X	
For Universities	X		
Implement and enforce policies that support women, children, families	X		
Offer transitional support to new faculty			X
Offer mentorship programs			X
Work for culture shift, rejection of ideal worker, and value women's contributions			X

> them are single or they don't have kids or their kids are grown and have left home or whatever it is so they can put in lots of hours and you know stay late in the evening and work on Saturdays and Sundays and do lots of things that keep them more productive than I am

Another participant described the culture of academia as inherently more rewarding to those who adhere to traditional gender roles. She stated:

> the academy is definitely set up for the man who has a wife who stays at home and raises the kids because it's not set up for a dual career couple, I'll tell you that, with kids. I think that is the model that is perpetuated

Moreover, five of the women mentioned feeling as though they were anomalies in academia because they had children and that they were perceived as such by their colleagues.

The second theme encompasses the experiences of women assistant professors interacting with the faculty in their departments. Many participants found difficulty assimilating into departments in which faculty adhered to traditional, male norms, and in which "the hierarchical and patriarchical system of academia is still alive and well." Several participants stated that they felt as though they were left to their own devices and that faculty made little or no effort to orient them to the job. Moreover, a majority of the women reflected that the feeling in the department was one of competition, individualism, politics and in some cases, aggression and that as women, this made assimilation into the department particularly difficult. In reflecting her discomfort with the political culture, one woman stated that her department "is a very large department, predominantly male – I basically hid my first year I was there – I hid in my office because I was afraid of the politics … I'm not good at politics." Another participant's comments provided a summation of many of the women's reactions to the isolation and competitive environment they experienced in academia:

> I feel it (academia) can be very isolating. People are always like "let's collaborate, let's collaborate" but you really do have to kind of you know "hey do you have something that you want to work on together?" Otherwise yeah you could just kind of be on your own the whole time. So I kind of feel like you know – and I think sometimes women are sometimes naturally you know want to be collaborative and work together and so it may just not feel like it's an inviting environment sometimes…. And I know that, as I said, people will say "oh lets collaborate and lets do things" but there's this kind of there's this whole thing "oh make sure you're first author on some – make sure you're first author" – there is still

> you know this sense that you need to do things independently and individualistically you know.

Some of the women felt that the way they were treated compared to new male faculty was telling. For example, one woman observed that

> coming from my experience as being a woman being hired here and then a couple of years after me they hired a male colleague. And so watching the comparison with that – has been really really interesting in that everything is easier for him.

Additionally, seven women stated that although they liked their colleagues, they felt uncomfortable if their departments were primarily composed of men. As one professor explained "I work in my program and I am the only female faculty and you know not that men are difficult to get along with but just being able to navigate all of those relationships sometimes has been challenging."

All of the participants commented on how their experience of their university or department culture is affected by their interactions with students making student interaction the third theme in the "culture" domain. Five of the participants found these experiences to be among the most rewarding part of their job stating "I love working with my students – its really rewarding when they appreciate the work I do with them." Also, seven of the participants believe that women faculty are "much more invested in their (students') welfare and their success" than male faculty.

Additionally, for some of the women, their experiences of the department culture were affected by perceptions of subtle, negative treatment by students. Three women reported that students tend to challenge female professors' competence and to make gender based assumptions about their abilities – often, for example, questioning their knowledge of statistics or assuming that male professors would display more

competence. Three of the women believed that students were also more likely to push boundaries with female professors or to:

> feel more entitled to challenge or to ask – to take more liberty with assistant professors than tenured professors and to take more liberty with female professors than male professors. I do see that to some extent…. That I felt like I have had to deal with some challenges that I don't think – that I would lay money that my senior male colleagues would never have a student approach them in such a way or say such a thing or ask such a thing of them.

Finally, eight of the women acknowledged either experiencing or observing female colleagues experience a conflict between being respected and liked. Often, this was perceived as occurring with faculty but more frequently, the participants ascribed this experience to their students thus:

> a conflict between being liked and respected – absolutely…. I think I get more respect now but I do think that I'm probably less liked. I think I'm expected to be warm and nurturing and supportive and for the most part, I am, especially compared to the rest of the faculty.

These participants "saw some women who felt that in order to be respected a woman had to be harsh" and that the stereotype still exists that "the woman who's assertive and is viewed as a bitch whereas the guy is someone who is respected."

Mentorship

All of the participants viewed mentorship as important to their success in academia although not all of the participants believed that they receive the mentorship they need. Four themes (informal, graduate school advisor, formal, none) were extracted from the data which describe the various mentoring relationships that participants discussed. The first, informal mentoring encompasses relationships with colleagues that have proved helpful, either professionally or personally, but which are not formally

arranged mentoring partnerships. Seven women described having such relationships. These relationships are often considered friendships by the participants, for example:

> Here I have a couple of friends who have been through the tenure process and other women who provide good advice along the way and I know that I can go to when issues arise and they are not in counseling psychology actually – they are just in other fields in education and so they are people I can go to and I think that is the way I do it – its more informal mentoring. There is one woman … she got tenure a couple years ago and has three young kids … and she'll have good input or will challenge me about this that or the other. So I definitely think that's something that – I mean I try to mentor and I always try to find people who I feel like I can trust who can provide that for me – I think that's really critical.

Although these informal mentoring relationships were described as additive to the participants' overall experiences some of the women would have preferred to:

> either have been assigned a mentor when I got here or just have known better how to seek that out in some more formal fashion when starting this position. There was a lot that I felt like I need to navigate on my own and that was intimidating.

Four of the seven individuals who had formal mentorship relationships seemed to greatly enjoy these relationships, particularly with regard to the professional assistance they provided. Two of women stated that the formal mentoring relationship was a pretense and the person was a mentor in name only. Additionally, three women stated that their formal mentors did not account for their unique position as mothers and academics and gave advice:

> that I have not found helpful. With the first person, she told me that I should never say no to a dissertation and that has been one of the worst pieces of advice that I have ever taken – she is someone who works – her life is her work – she works all the time – she loves that she has no children, no relationship so I think that she has been able to say yes to every dissertation.

Conversely, most found the relationship invaluable with regard to getting help with research and publication, adjusting to the new role as an assistant professor, or helping

with the barriers and hurdles that must be overcome to achieve tenure. Personally, though, many of the participants still reported taking advantage of informal mentoring with colleagues as the quote from this woman demonstrates:

> I think that the people who are not my formal mentors but are still you know um very ready and willing and inviting to be informal mentors – have been those have been more the ones that I've gone to around more of that intersection of the personal and professional – how to manage that.

Furthermore, four of the women continued the mentoring relationships with their faculty advisors that they had enjoyed in graduate school even if they were at different universities. While some of these relationships did eventually fade over time due to the demands on both the mentor and the mentee, some graduate school mentors continued to provide assistance to their former students in a variety of ways. As one woman described it:

> I think my mentor from graduate school who continues to be my mentor has been a really important part of my professional development. She you know when I talk to her she continues to encourage me. She is also (of the same cultural background) … seeing what she's achieved helps me to see – ok she can do it. She has, you know, three daughters, she did all this – climb the ladder when she had kids so just knowing you know it's possible and having somebody who has the same kind of family values you know.

Three of the women felt as though they did not have a mentor at all. This resulted from either dissolution of a former mentoring relationship or from the lack of a formal mentoring program at the participant's university. Moreover, the lack of mentorship was also due to formal mentorship programs that provided no actual mentoring or the fact that no informal mentors were present or satisfactory.

The women in this situation primarily described this experience as highly frustrating, isolating, and challenging both personally and professionally. One woman did state that she found one positive aspect of the lack of mentorship was that she was forced

to be "independent" and "reach out"; however, most women without mentors expressed sentiments more similar to this:

> I don't have a mentor… I'll have to learn through the school of hard knocks by doing it wrong and then finding out it was wrong and then next time I'll do it better but it is frustrating cause I don't feel like I really know everything there is to know…. You know the other thing is I really like working as part of a team… so I think I would be more productive if I had a mentor. Yeah – feeling like I'm not totally in this alone and I've got to figure it out all by myself.

One woman also described the frustration she felt with not having any mentoring to guide her through the process of applying for and taking maternity leave:

> There was no mentoring around that at all you know about how to handle that and how to navigate that – I was kind of floundering around my first year… just not having somebody to necessarily turn to get support – it was definitely intimidating and frustrating.

Additionally, these women ascribed their lack of mentorship to their gender. One woman, when describing the difference in how she was treated when compared with her male colleague reported that:

> I had said before that that my first couple years here as I was kind of finding my place in my department the other faculty wouldn't seek me out and they went to seek my male colleague out. They um sought him out to work with on research and where I worked hard to seek out other people the senior faculty sought him out.

The presence and quality of the mentorship relationship appears to be crucial to these female academicians' feelings of support – so much so that three of the participants stated that one of their priorities is providing mentorship to others. Those with competent mentors, who took an interest in their progress and professional and personal well-being, were much more likely to report feeling that their university culture is "really supportive of new faculty. They want us to be able to get tenure."

Children, Work/Family Conflict, and Family Friendly Policies

More than any other, this domain elicited the most intense reactions and perhaps the most unified responses, as almost every participant's experiences of combining motherhood and academia were congruent. The themes in this domain include multiple role strain, departmental support, family friendly policies, childcare, and romantic partner.

Every participant reported experiencing significant multiple role strain in trying to balance the demands of their career and their family. For example, participants frequently stated that balancing work and family:

> is really challenging. I don't know how to say it – I mean I don't know – and I tell myself I'm like I don't think I'm the best at it but I don't think I'm the worst at it either – I mean I reassure myself. But it's sort of a constant, daily, hourly struggle because I mean trying to get all the work done and trying not to cut corners with her (daughter) because she's my priority. You know its really challenging. I mean I guess it seems like there is always something. I guess I wonder a lot am I spending enough time with her? I think I'm pretty good like its not like I sit in my office and sometimes like think about her to the point of distraction but – I mean its really hard to fit the amount of work that we have to do in even a 8-5 day and then I don't know like when I'm working and just spend – you come home in the evenings and … it's a lot of time I'm like – even if you get there at 4:30 or 5:00 or whatever you have to make dinner and then you have that crazy time until 8:00 or 8:30 or whatever until they go to bed and then there's like so many other things that you can't you know – and then the day starts again the next morning at like 6:00.

Other women echoed these sentiments with comments such as:

> I think that um that it is that the demands on um on the academic demands especially for tenure and promotion and those kinds of things are such that it requires a commitment that my guess is most women with young children are not able to fulfill and maintain their sanity at the same time;

and:

> Being able to produce at the level which I need to in order to get tenure you know has been quite a challenge. Trying to figure out "ok what is the

> pace?" and that pace is going to differ year to year based on where I'm at in my research you know and so that's another on-going challenge. So it's the whole tenure process in and of itself. And then beyond – and then trying to figure out that balance between home and work in how you, how you do that in a way that you feel good about both of those roles. You know I don't, you know I don't want to get tenure and then look back and say "wow, I've neglected my family and I've neglected my children"…. How to feel good about being a mom, being a family member, and being an academic.

Seven participants commented on the flexible nature of academia. While some stated that this perceived flexibility alleviates some of the pressure they feel from multiple role strain, a number of the women commented on their belief that for them, flexibility does not apply. For example, one woman stated that:

> The schedule of university life you know one could argue is flexible but as my friend always says, it's a myth of flexibility because if your kid's sick and you're not getting stuff done, you're not making up the hours anywhere – you don't find the time anywhere else – you still have to go home and make dinner and have – you know all the things you need to do.

Another, related topic of concern that arose during the interviews for six of the women was the idea of clock overlap – that the pressures of tenure occur, for many women, during the time of life when they are most biologically capable of having children. One woman said that she had a colleague who she wished could have participated in this research study but couldn't because:

> she doesn't have any kids. She's been trying to have kids. She is in her late thirties now and one of the things that she is very very upset about is because she doesn't – here she is, she's going up for tenure this year, she doesn't know if she's going to make tenure and she basically gave up her childbearing years trying to get tenure.

Another woman stated that she feels pressure to have a child due to her age but worries that her faculty will disapprove. Her comments convey this frustration and the frustration she believes many women feel that leads them to leave academia:

> If I go ahead and have another kid for myself personally, I don't know that that's a great idea because I finally got this open chance to really focus and it doesn't make sense for me personally but I'll be 38 in two more years. And then I think if I do get pregnant and all the faculty knows everything that I've been through and it's like how are they going to feel you know like "she got this second and third chance and what is she doing?" I just feel like maybe why women don't succeed is that they just – it's almost just sometimes too hard to kind of integrate those personal and work decisions where it just doesn't make you happy.

Maternity leave and family friendly policies were another theme that sparked analogous reactions from most women. Two of the participants were satisfied with the maternity leave policies at their university and this comment from one of them reflects that:

> I found them (family friendly policies) to be very good so my feeling is that at least at (my University) – I can't speak to other places. They have this policy – this extension policy. They have something where you can negotiate with your department where you can do other duties – you don't have to teach – so you can do that if you are going to have a baby or small child. In talking to my department chair over the years about things to do – if you go down to half time – how honestly you have to be able to afford to do that – but if you do that, that stops the clock on tenure.

However, nine participants, including one of the two who was happy with the leave she got with her first child, were dissatisfied with the family friendly policies. They made comments reflecting the fact that they "wished there were more family friendly policies" such as better maternity leave benefits and realistic part-time options. Commonly, the participants complained that family friendly policies simply did not exist. Additionally, nine participants felt that the maternity leave that is offered is inadequate and three women worried that faculty who take advantage of either maternity leave and/or other family friendly policies, such as stopping the tenure clock, would be penalized for doing so. One academic said:

> Maternity leave here is pretty poor. You get twelve weeks by law, but the faculty manual says six weeks or less. That's kind of archaic … There's a lot of debate with that faculty women's group that if you take that extra year are you then expected to have produced more.

Other participants discussed the difficulty that they had taking advantage of the maternity leave that was offered. Three women stated that they had to petition, apply, or win the leave that was offered by their university and reported that this was a stressful process because the leave is not "something you can rely on I guess or expect." Another woman complained that in order to get maternity leave:

> you have to use your sick leave. And when people say we have a great policy I don't think they realize, I really don't think that they realize that it – that what it's making you do, is use your sick leave for that. Cause that's what it is – they call it family leave – its not family leave, its converted sick leave.

This was seen as problematic because you had to accumulate enough sick leave prior to having a child in order to take leave and because once you exhausted your sick leave by taking maternity leave you had no ability to take time off if you or your child became ill.

Some women described not taking leave at all when their children were born. This was due to either being so new to the position that leave was not permitted or being fearful that colleagues or the university would question the pregnant academic's commitment to the tenure process if she asked for leave. One professor stated that she was "afraid to make my department figure it out" so she did not take leave and "took on solving that problem for the department" by returning to work quickly. Moreover, a faculty member who was new to her department when her first child was born stated:

> I didn't take maternity leave with my first child – I took two weeks off cause I was new to the position and frankly just wasn't allowed to take maternity leave. And then so – I was kind of angry about that and you know whatever. But with my second child I did take maternity leave so I

> took advantage of that and I was gone for six weeks and I wouldn't come in for stuff.

She also reported feeling:

> scared to ask about – you know – on the university level I was just afraid to ask (about maternity leave) I was afraid that people were going to think that I wasn't committed and that they just hired me and now I was going to take off and have a baby and I was frustrated by fact that when I called human resources and talked to – like nobody sort of knew what maternity leave was or how it was handled and no one could point me in the right direction.

The last part of the above quote touches on another problem three participants experienced with maternity leave in academia – that of unclear, ad-hoc policies and/or administrators being uncertain about their university's benefits regarding maternity leave and other family friendly policies. This was experienced as stressful because of the difficulty determining what policies, if any, exist. Additionally, this lack of information was also frustrating because the lack of knowledge leads to underutilization by faculty and therefore, a culture in which taking advantage of policies that exist is seen as unusual or something that should be penalized.

Three other notable categories were exposed through the interviews. First, six participants felt that as mothers, they are anomalies in academia and therefore receive either no or ineffective support from their colleagues, their departments, and/or their institutions. Thus:

> the academic culture is one where few of the faculty have children to begin with and very few of the female faculty have children and so they devote a lot of their time and energy and kind of a lot of their self-definition comes from their job.

One woman expressed the frustration of having ineffective support from women without children by saying:

> My tenured, female colleagues who do not have children, even those that um feel a solidarity with me and my colleagues, my female colleagues who do have children, and feel as though, feel as though they are supporting us in combining motherhood and professional life, even they don't get it. They don't get it and so they'll offer alternatives or suggestions or advice that they think is helpful that really is just way off. Not, not the way that it's going to work. Are not getting it. And then when, then when we don't take that up or do things a different way or struggle, they can't understand it. Because they are like "you could have just done this." No – that doesn't work and the reason why you don't know that it doesn't work is because you're not a mom. You know or you don't have kids and I know that you're trying to be helpful but it's actually not helpful. And in some ways you know I think that may even be the harder judgment you know what I mean, to deal with. As somebody who um, who as somebody who's trying to combine both. Um its um its harder when you get that kind of negative judgment from somebody who thinks that they're being supportive than they're, than somebody who doesn't even get it, you know what I mean – doesn't try and knows that they're not really trying and just expects you to do it kind of the traditional way versus someone who thinks that they're being accommodating and they're actually not being accommodating in ways that are helpful.

Later in the interview, she also stated that the same issues with ineffective support result with her male colleagues. Another faculty member at a different institution complained about the complete lack of support she received from her colleagues around her desire to get pregnant. She also expresses how uncomfortable this made her feel by reporting:

> the advice from both of them was "oh don't you want to wait until you get tenure" and I was like – you know I was like "well no because then I'd be 36 or 37 when I'm having my first kid". And so the advice you get is certainly you know the climate doesn't feel very warm. You know its almost like – and I almost felt like when I got pregnant its like gosh you know you don't want to come out about it because its going to be seen as like you aren't serious about tenure or you know like I almost got like "oh you shouldn't be doing that" which is crazy.

There was some ambivalence regarding support however, as all of the women noted at least some attempts by their departments to support them having children despite the lack of support and inflexible nature of the larger university. Examples of this type of support include baby showers, words of encouragement, or the flexibility of not working

in the summer or working from home on occasion of which some women felt they could still take advantage.

Additionally, six women in this study frequently attributed the anemic rates of tenure and promotion by mothers and the robust rates of tenure and promotion by childless faculty and fathers to gender differences in parenting responsibilities and that "research still shows that women still have the second shift." For example, one woman stated her beliefs that:

> even though the gender roles are changing, the women are going to tend to have the parenting responsibilities and you know, I see at least one person in my department – she has two young children – and she just finally walked away from the process. You know, it just wasn't happening, she wasn't happy and she just didn't have enough time with her kids and all that.

Another woman stated that even in couples where the partners are very cognizant of the second shift phenomenon and attempt to be egalitarian in terms of the division of labor and parenting, frequently "there's still an assumption that the default is the mom does all the childrearing and the father tries to help out to 50% but it's still that he's helping out to 50% instead of it being a 50-50 breakdown." Moreover, breastfeeding was also cited by many of the women as adding "a whole other level of complexity and time commitment" to the already stressed, overextended lives of mother academics.

Daycare was also cited as problematic by more than half of the participants. There were multiple reasons why childcare led to additional burdens on women. For example, the need for full-time childcare in order to achieve tenure and promotion, the lack of access to high quality childcare on campus either because it is not offered or demand outweighs the supply leading to excessively long wait-lists, and the expense of full-time childcare with no subsidies from the universities were all mentioned as being difficult.

Furthermore, the professors protested about the incompatibility of childcare options with the schedules that academics must keep and the lack of understanding from colleagues. For example one professor stated that:

> they (non-mothers) don't understand either. I mean this semester I had to change times for a course and there was a guy that … wanted to know why I couldn't teach at eight o'clock and its just like "well I have to drop my son off. I can't get to - I can't get to campus. But he just looked appalled. You know why can't I teach an eight o'clock class and it was like you know – but you know why can't you get childcare for an hour? What? You don't get … good God – who gets childcare you know from seven to eight a.m. in the morning.

Six of the participants commented on the interrelationship between their relationship with their partners and their pursuit of tenure. Specifically, the pressures tenure put on their relationship with regard to managing all the professional, household, and childrearing responsibilities, particularly if both of the partners are assistant professors was emphasized. One example of this is evident in this comment:

> I do think that its particularly hard, especially if you are at the same stage of your career – you're both assistant professors and you're both going for tenure – it's a lot of pressure in one household and then you're potty training and doing all that other stuff – its pretty crazy and if you know we hadn't had a really solid marriage going into it – I mean we often say – we've got to get through these years. "See you tonight" and that's that. I think it's particularly difficult and I see dual career couples get divorced.

Four women spoke of the support that they received from their partners and how they never would have made it through their graduate school programs or this far in their careers without their partner's support. Moreover, having a partner with a geographically flexible career seemed particularly important for as this woman states – her husband:

> pretty much moved to (internship location) from (graduate school location) with me for internship and when I moved to (current university location) for a job he moved and got a job. I mean he's basically happy to follow me whatever I do and so that obviously has made a huge difference.

The benefit or even the necessity of having a partner with a flexible career becomes even more apparent from comments like this:

> What I have noticed in my own experience and also what I've noticed being a part of the search committee you know to fill different positions in our department – both counseling psychology and elsewhere – I have found that it is increasingly difficult to hire women and keep women in academic positions – especially women who are partnered with a professional male companion you know whether it is married or connected in some way… that finding you know jobs for those people becomes increasingly more challenging.

This participant then went on to say that she does not see the same phenomenon occur when the situation is reversed – i.e. when the male is seeking the academic job and his wife will have to relocate. However, she was unable to offer a hypothesis as to why this would be the case.

Gender Discrimination and Harassment

All of the participants reported experiencing or observing some type of discrimination or harassment in their department with nine of the ten reporting personal experience with gender discrimination/harassment. There are three themes in this domain including covert discrimination, overt discrimination, and the glass ceiling.

Many of the incidents of discrimination reported by the participants were subtle or covert forms of discrimination/harassment that are difficult to identify, often dismissed when reported, but create an uncomfortable atmosphere for the targets of the comments or behaviors. These are microaggressions, which, individually are not overly significant but when one encounters a lot of them, they cause tremendous discomfort and pain. Eight women reported experiencing such events.

Four women mentioned the frequency of departmental gender role stereotyping where female staff or faculty members are expected to organize social events for the department and feel as though the "faculty have definitely taken advantage of …qualities associated with traditional femininity." For instance:

> I get really irritated with my male colleagues when we host events and its expected that myself or other female colleagues will set up the refreshments and clean up and you know I see that across different disciplines or kind of being the ones who are always initiating some kind of social event for the university and kind of being the hospitality queen because no one else will do that. And then if they are in charge of something like that you will notice that there is a secretary doing it – they aren't the ones doing it – so I think that's kind of covert (gender discrimination).

This also takes place when service tasks need to be completed. Another faculty member stated that:

> I noticed that men will just say "well I'm not going to do that" you know for whatever little task comes up – "no sorry I'm not going to go to the graduate student open house." The dean wants somebody to go and they'll just say "I'm not doing it." Or, so I noticed that the – it often falls on the women in the department to pick up these little kind of menial tasks.

Three women also mentioned feeling as though their research is not respected, "not as valued," "not as relevant or important" or is seen as "soft science" due to either the subject matter under investigation or the method used. Five of the participants also reported that their unique contributions such as taking on service activities and providing mentorship and support for students are not respected toward tenure. This was seen as difficult because these contributions make it harder for female faculty to focus on their research:

> the demands on women, especially in programs like counseling psychology where there are more female students, there's more emotional demands on women handling just the – I guess emotional issues for the

> students and even emotional – kind of feeling relational issues going on in the department they turn to women more to handle those things and those things take a lot of time and energy…time that I'm not putting into my research which means that its less likely that I'm going to get tenure.

Furthermore, having children and taking maternity leave were recognized by three of the women as reasons why they or other women have experienced subtle discrimination thus:

> One of the things that often comes up in my faculty … they talk about students who are ABD working on dissertation and they have a kid and half the faculty you know gets really upset about it – they get really upset with the student…. For example, one student had a child before she went on internship and then ended up deciding to kind of postpone internship and do it half time over two years. They (the faculty) just – they just get upset and annoyed with those types of decisions.

Other forms of covert gender discrimination mentioned include feeling, as a woman, that one has to "prove myself a little bit more – a lot more actually" to garner the same respect as male colleagues. Finally, some women reported feeling as though they had to "walk a fine line between knowing – between being competent and not being too pushy I guess because that would threaten their (male colleagues) ego."

Overt forms of discrimination and harassment were also reported by seven women. Four women experienced misogynistic or anit-pregnancy/family comments from colleagues. For example:

> I certainly got comments from people when I decided to have a child that – where they implied that I must – that must not be something that I planned because why would I do this before I was tenured. Right, because why would any sane person – you know it's kind of compared to the ideal worker – why you know why would you have a child when you're not tenured.

One women complained of "occasions where there are comments made about women in my presence that I consider disrespectful."

Two women also stated that they know that they are "paid less relative to our peers." This was attributed this to "institutionalized sexism" and the university's taking advantage of their lack of skill in negotiating their salary.

Additionally, two women mentioned anecdotes suggesting that their colleagues react negatively to them when they assert their feelings on particular issues. For example, one woman relayed an episode where she was voicing her opinion about a sensitive topic and:

> one of my male colleagues and actually a couple of them you know sort of joined on the bandwagon once when I had – I had an issue and I was raising it a the department meeting and they were all like well "I guess you're in a bad mood today." I was like "excuse me – you know I'm not happy about this, I am angry – you know why do you have to attribute this to my mood?"… It was absolutely dismissive and I really noticed – I felt like it was sexist to say you know you're in a bad mood. I'm sorry but don't write me off by telling me I'm in a bad mood.

The final theme of gender discrimination culled from the data was institutional discrimination. Four women stated that at this early point in their careers they had not experienced the glass ceiling but had observed its effects on other, more senior women. However, five women did mention feeling as though they had to "impose a ceiling on myself." In other words, some of the participants felt as though the institutional structure of their university and the societal values imposed on them were so inhospitable to their attempts to have both career and family that they had to resolve the conflict in ways that put significant limitations on their careers.

Intrapersonal Issues

Numerous intrapersonal struggles were mentioned by the female participants that they believed were specific to women and which made their experience in academia qualitatively different from that of their male colleagues. While much of the previous

literature touches on these issues and incorporates them into discussions on other topics, the breadth and depth of psychological and emotional disclosure was felt to be extensive enough to warrant a separate category.

One theme within this topic was "myths" – that is, beliefs that were held or standards that were internalized by the participants that impacted their perceptions of their careers, their family, and themselves. For example, the "superwoman" myth was being lived by all of the participants. One participant explains it this way:

> I've just seen a lot of women you know quit basically their careers because of you know its really incompatible with raising children and its kind of interesting because I'm like I'm in my early thirties and its like you know we were brought up to think you know "you're going to be able to do everything" – it didn't even occur to me until I was 29 that it could be difficult.

Two of the women also believed that they would be able to accelerate off the "mommy track" once their children were older.

Another, related myth that puts added pressure on two female faculty members was the "Betty Crocker" myth – the idea that you have to fulfill an idealized image of a good mother. For example one faculty member stated:

> I felt like I really needed to be a good mother. You know I was on the PTA – you know I went through all of this neurotic stuff like when you had to bring in cupcakes for your kids' birthdays and you know like they had to be home baked. I remember going to the bakery and saying "can you just give me unfrosted cupcakes and I'll just decorate them myself". Because you know we live in a fairly wealthy town and there are a lot of stay at home moms and so the idea that I would not you know not being the perfect Betty Crocker mother – Suzie homemaker or whatever. So what I would do was – you know the kids would go to bed – I'd probably get them into bed around nineish um and you know after they had their bath and reading and all of that and then I would get to start on my work.

A final example of a myth that was internalized by many and cited by four of the participants is that of the ideal worker. These four women acknowledged struggling with

this internalized belief about what it means to be a good employee or academician especially after having children. Some women penalized themselves for being unable to live up to the standards to which they subscribed. One woman declared:

> The ideal worker thing that you (the researcher) were just talking about really hit home. You know in terms of the way you need to be committed to your job and how your job somehow comes before your family and you know that you – and part of it I think is and I'll just speak for myself, part of this is my – is likely my internalization of that value you know – um and my belief – its not even really my belief- but just that I've kind of internalized that and so times that I'm not working when I and its like Monday through Friday 8:00 to 5:00 and I'm not working – I feel guilty about that. For whatever reason – because I'm caring for a child or because – whatever I'm doing and part of that guilt certainly would come from the fact that society does kind of hold that value that you know this is a forty-hour week and its 8:00 to 5:00 – you need to be working and you shouldn't have to ask for time off for these kinds of things and you know in this society we don't really value care of family in the same way that we value work.

Nine of the participants also expressed common emotional factors that impact their ability to succeed professionally and personally. Three of the women complained of chronic stress and exhaustion or fatigue. Four women also expressed concern or worry about how their life circumstances were likely to impact both their children and their careers. Moreover, three of the women expressed ambivalence about their role in academia and felt persistent insecurity about their ability to succeed. Finally, four of the women expressed feelings of guilt – both toward their children and toward their colleagues/department. The frequently felt as though:

> it's (balancing work and family) difficult and I feel guilty about it. Guilt's the word that keeps coming into my head. I don't want to say guilt inducing because I know that that's coming from inside of me but when I think about trying to balance those things I always feel like – many many times since I started graduate school work has won out and it shouldn't have and I think I sacrificed a lot of time with my children – getting a doctoral degree and now attempting to get tenure.

The final theme in this domain is that of gender socialization. Nine of the participants commented on how the gender traits that they believed they had internalized as part of the socialization process were incompatible with the skills required to succeed in academia. Four women stated that they felt that they, and women generally, "are socialized to just be nice and helpful and self-sacrificing." Four women also reported that they had to "go against my gender socialization to be nice and nurturing and that kind of thing and that's part of the – my male colleagues don't have to do that and so its easier for them I think."

The desire to be nice and helpful manifests behaviorally. Six women faculty reported having a hard time setting boundaries or saying no which results in them having:

> more on their plate and maybe sometimes they take more on themselves. They might volunteer or agree to do something that doesn't get them closer to tenure but they will do it – maybe they feel guilty about not doing it or they feel bad if they don't do it whereas I think … men have an easier time of just saying no to certain things.

This conflict also created a double edged sword for many of the participants. For example, if they attempted to set boundaries and be assertive, they frequently worry that they will "disappoint somebody by setting a limit" and/or will "not succeed in the interpersonal aspects of the office" because:

> if they're assertive about that (not doing as much service) it's perceived more negatively by the people doing the asking that "oh they're not being a team player" when they somehow accept that more from a man saying no.

However, if women subscribe to traditional gender traits and/or have a more difficult time setting boundaries, then they are penalized because they do not have enough time to devote to their research and their other contributions do not help them achieve tenure.

Recommendations

The final questions asked participants for their recommendations – both to other women in or about to enter the field of counseling psychology academia and to universities and departments. With regard to recommendations for women, the two dominant themes that emerged involved creating a supportive atmosphere through mentorship and friendships and becoming more assertive and enforcing boundaries so as to avoid being taken advantage of or taken for granted. Seven of the women commented on the need for women in academia to "stick together – talk to each other – don't feel like you have to do this alone." Moreover, seven women suggested finding a mentor or providing mentorship for others. Regarding the need for boundary setting, eight participants advised their peers to avoid feeling "like you always have to say yes every time somebody asks you to do something" and to be able to say "no and I thank you, but not right now."

One other less common theme that emerged for women was related to cultural issues in departments and academia. Six participants suggested getting a sense of the culture of the department one is thinking about joining, particularly with regard to family friendliness. One participant encouraged "women to go into academia because the more of us who don't get tenure or decide to leave because of all of the things that I've talked about, means that change doesn't happen."

For universities, the participants wished for a "culture shift" and a way to "interrupt the whole institutional sexism thing" and create "a friendlier climate where you're kind of actively saying 'alright, this is the reality of women's lives and what they do so let's talk about it." The participants had different ideas about how to go about

changing the academic ethos. All ten participants wanted universities to provide additional support to women and/or new faculty generally. Many wished for assistance with childcare – high quality, on-campus childcare and/or subsidized childcare. Others requested "better maternity leave packages and more part-time options."

Three participants wished for support in the shape of mentorship programs or financial remuneration for all of the expenses incurred to make tenure, such as travel fees, conference attendance fees, research expenses, and membership in professional organization dues. Similarly, three wished for research fellowships so that they could devote summers to research rather than having to teach classes to make ends meet. Finally, three other women wanted the culture shift to include eliminating the myopic focus on research productivity by "acknowledging the additional work that's done in terms of working with students – that could be for men or women, but the fact of the matter is that more women do it and it's not acknowledged. It's not valued."

Ultimately, the participants wanted to have a voice in the discussion – to have some say as far as what they needed and how universities could help level the playing field. To do this, one participant suggested:

> I think that universities might just want to talk to the women on campus and find out how they are doing and what they think they need. You know this has to be driven based on data so they have to do benchmarking – find out are they loosing more women than other places are… so a climate survey for the women on campus… do a salary survey and make sure that there's equity; find out if the women feel like they're shouldering an unfair amount of the burden…. Don't just necessarily automatically blame the women for being defective.

Discussion

The results of this study demonstrate that female counseling psychology academics with children face a number of gender-specific challenges that may explain

why women continue to struggle to achieve tenure and promotion to full professor at the same rates as men. The results, in large part, confirm what the literature suggests with only a few minor disparities. A discussion of the findings, the researcher's personal journey and the strengths and limitations of the study follow. Implications for future policy changes and research are also included.

Academic Culture and Issues of Assimilation

Participants' statements about the culture of their departments and about the academy generally suggest that the research on departmental socialization is accurate – women have additional burdens that make operating within the traditional academic culture and assimilation into their departments more difficult than for men (Fouad & Carter, 1992). While all assistant professors must manage the pressures of the tenure track, these issues make the process more challenging for female faculty.

The data suggests that this is, in large part, due to the chasm between the patriarchal, male-dominated culture that pervades most of the participants' departments and the sense of self, gender identity, and valuable but not valued competencies of many of the women faculty. Many of the women stated that they enjoyed their career and that their colleagues were friendly. Despite this, every participant expressed multiple assimilation challenges. Some of these challenges primarily reflected difficulty with faculty members or the tenor of the department. For others, students caused the greatest difficulty. However, these difficulties shared one central characteristic. All were the result of the participants' status as outsiders or cultural minorities attempting to break into a system whose rules they do not entirely understand or feel comfortable with, at least initially (Fouad & Carter, 1992; Kite et al., 2001). Presumably, most males, who

enter a university or department that ascribes to a culture and upholds standards and values that reflect those with which he is well acquainted, would not have the same challenges.

Feelings of alienation from the dominant culture appear to be an overarching issue under which many of the other domains fall. For example, lack of appropriate mentorship, inadequate or absent family friendly policies and support, and gender discrimination can all be conceptualized as problems that fall under the umbrella concept of cultural alienation. Therefore, remedy for the aforementioned issues is a necessary albeit not sufficient part of cultural change. Possible remedies are discussed below.

Mentorship

The literature suggests that for women, having a competent mentor who understands the challenges of her protégée is essential for female academics success (Esberspacher & Sisler, 1988; Fouad & Carter, 1992). This study's data bares this out. The participants' comments demonstrate that effective, supportive mentorship, whether in the departments, or as holdovers from graduate school, was invaluable. Conversely, those women who did not have mentorship of any type felt isolated, burdened, and frustrated on both the professional and personal fronts.

Regarding informal mentorship, the results from this study differ from what is suggested in the literature. Fouad and Carter (1992) propose that when systems of mentorship are informal, women may suffer because of the difficulties they have in breaking into and being accepted by these support systems. This may be true when one looks at women's attempts to join traditional types of informal mentorship that might be more easily accessible to men. However, what is not accounted for is the tenacity of

many of the female academics regarding their ability to find their own informal mentorship relationships in the form of compassionate friends and colleagues who are coping with many of the same challenges. Even if they had to find them outside their programs, departments, or campuses, many of the women described invaluable relationships that have sustained them through their career and personal challenges.

The importance of mentorship indicates that universities should increase their attempts to institute various mentorship programs. From formal mentoring arrangements where actual mentoring occurs, to creating programs or other opportunities to support female faculties' attempts to find helpful informal mentors, universities have a relatively easy, clear-cut opportunity to help women make progress in academia. Unlike the more complex area of family friendly polices, creating these types of supportive programs for women can be done with relative ease, with moderate to little expense, and with limited controversy.

Work-Family Conflict

Mason and Goulden's research (2002; 2004) was accurate – having children, particularly prior to achieving tenure, puts significant strain on female academics' ability to succeed professionally. Participants' confirmed the views of multiple sources (APA Task Force on Women in Academe, 2000; APA Presidential Initiative on Work and Family, 2004; Fouad & Carter, 1992; Halpern, 2004; Park & Nolen-Hoeksema, 2004; Riemenschinieder & Harper, 1990) – that multiple role strain and the phenomenon of the second shift are primary reasons why they believe they and other women have a more difficult time achieving tenure and promotion. There simply is not enough time in the day to successfully manage all of their professional and personal responsibilities. Time

restriction forces the female academics to be unable to dedicate as many hours to their research. Moreover, the participants' statements reflect that the psychological, emotional, and physical toll of multiple role strain and the second shift has left them exhausted and highly stressed.

In this study, fear was a contributing factor in the difficulties that the participants had with family friendly policies. However, it was not the primary reason most women did not take advantage of family friendly policies. Rather, the ineffectiveness or complete lack of family friendly policies and support at most of the participants' universities was most salient for the women faculty in this study. Poor family friendly policies as a result of university adherence to the ideal worker mindset (Crosby, et al, 2004) seemed to significantly compound the effects of multiple role strain and the second shift (Quinn et al., 2004; Sullivan et al., 2004; Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2004). The fact that 90% of the participants were unhappy with the maternity leave policies and the lack of other family friendly policies such as a valid part-time option, suggests that this is an almost universal problem at universities across the country. Even the one participant who was happy with the formal maternity leave policies at her university complained of feeling unsupported in her decision to have a child by some of the faculty who she considers friends.

Moreover, the women expressed their frustration and concern about the fact that the support that is offered was ineffective. This problem was not as clearly reflected in the literature but adds a new dimension of complexity to the problem. By not incorporating the female academics with children in the discussion and planning of family friendly policy, universities have done a disservice to their female faculty. By making assumptions about the needs and wishes of mothers in their departments, fellow

faculty members have imposed their own beliefs and values and suffered an empathic failure toward their colleagues.

Through this approach, universities have also hurt themselves. Their policies do not engender loyalty and lead to chronically stressed and fatigued faculty. As a result, universities are reducing creativity and productivity and losing talented faculty who could make significant contributions to their institution and field.

Surprisingly, when asked specifically about the maternal wall, very few of the participants endorsed having this experience. However, this is likely due to a flaw in the way the question was asked or the explanation of the concept given by the primary investigator. The participants seemed to focus on the phrase "penalized by her co-workers" which was present in the explanation. Most participants denied being penalized however they gave clear, albeit, often covert examples of being penalized throughout the rest of the interview. It is possible that many of the participants could not think of specific, overt ways their colleagues or the field of academia had penalized them for becoming mothers. The effects of the maternal wall on academic women therefore, should be studied further. A quantitative investigation, perhaps by replicating Halpert et al's, 1993 study and/or Cuddy et al's, 2004 study would be one possible way to determine the maternal wall's presence in the academy.

Discrimination and Harassment

Much of the discrimination noted by the participants confirms what is described in the literature. Women feeling as though their roles and contributions were not valued toward tenure and that their research was at times, seen as inadequate regarding method or subject matter is evidence that these subtle discriminatory events occur with relative

frequency (Knights & Richards, 2003; Ridgeway & Correll, 2004; Williams, 2005). The participants' experiences with competency issues, either having to work harder to prove competence or being penalized for being too competent or assertive, also mirrors what the literature posits as a common form of subtle gender discrimination (Williams, 2003; 2005). Additionally, the difference in salaries mentioned by some of the women reflects previous data found in the literature (APA Task Force on Women in Academe, 2000).

The subtle and overt expressions of discrimination against the participants becoming pregnant or taking maternity leave reinforces the notion that fear may be a primary reason why family friendly policies continue to languish (Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2004). The underlying message behind this type of discrimination is that pregnancy and childbirth are at best, an inconvenience that must be born by the department and at worst, unwanted, evidence of one's lack of commitment to academia, and reason to deny tenure.

Every participant shared feeling uncomfortable with at least one aspect of their decision to have a child and/or to take leave albeit their colleagues' responses, the difficulties they experienced with leave and family friendly policies and/or their fear of being seen as less than serious about their career. Many of the women stated that they took it upon themselves to try to mediate the impact of their decisions on the department, sometimes by taking extreme measures such as not taking maternity leave at all.

The universality of the participants' experiences in this area suggests that a pervasive form of both spoken and unspoken discrimination against pregnancy and women with young children exists and is entwined in the culture of academia. The feelings and behaviors shared by the participants are evidence that universities are, at the

very least, guilty by omission. By failing to act in meaningful ways, academia is complicit in maintaining a culture that is hospitable to this form of discrimination.

Experiencing this type of covert or overt discrimination makes it even more difficult for women to take advantage of the paltry maternity leave and family friendly policies their universities do offer. Additionally, this discrimination, whether covert or overt, diminishes university incentive to change maternity leave policies because it reinforces the administrators' fears of being perceived as imparting special treatment on one group, altering the long-standing tenure timeline and structure, incurring financial costs, and compromising the university's reputation for research and scholarship (Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2004). This type of discrimination also stifles women's attempts to advocate for improving family friendly policies. Women are likely to remain silent because they fear reprisal and are cognizant of the power differential between themselves and the academy.

Intrapersonal Factors

As stated in the results section, previous theoretical and empirical contributions in this area comment on various emotional and psychological factors that affect women academics. However, discussion of these dynamics are incorporated into other topics. For example, much of the research mentions the stress that women feel as evidence of the impact of multiple role strain on functioning (APA Presidential Initiative on Work and Family, 2004; APA Task Force on Women in Academe, 2000; Caplan, 2003; Fouad & Carter, 1992; Halpern, 2004; Park & Nolen-Hoeksema, 2004; Riemenschinieder & Harper, 1990). To fully do justice to the emotional and psychological experiences of the participants in this study, a separate category was created.

Many of the women did express their attempts to cope with the chronic stress, fatigue, guilt and ambivalence that result from the strain of trying to excel at a high-pressured, competitive career and as a nurturing, devoted mother. The commentary on the role of myths and the extent to which women academics had difficulties with assertiveness is additive to the understanding of female counseling psychologists' experiences in academia.

The myths described by the participants suggest an internalization of assumptions and societal messages about the rules that structure both the professorial and motherhood experiences. The "superwoman" myth – that women can do it all and have it all without consequences or repercussions, the "ideal worker" myth – that in order to be a good employee, one must be completely dedicated to one's career, and the "Good Mother" myth – that in order to be a competent mother, one must be singly devoted to one's children, are pervasive. The internalization of these myths by academics has implications for how women expect to manage their multiple roles and the emotional impact that failure to do so may have on these women.

Although not directly discussed by the participants, it is also likely that the academy and individual departments have internalized these myths. If so, these myths potentially guide their expectations of female professors with children and may subtly influence the decisions made about family friendly accommodation and university-wide policies and procedures.

Also worthy of note is participants' difficulty with assertive behavior and setting boundaries. This difficulty has been alluded to in the literature through discussion of the divide between the culture of academia and the socialization of many women (Fouad &

Carter, 1992; Park & Nolen-Hoeksema, 2004). However, this study teases out some of the specific underpinnings of the assertiveness issue. This data suggests that assertiveness and boundary setting is problematic because of two other concepts – female gender socialization and the conflict between being respected and liked.

Female gender socialization seems to pose a barrier to assertiveness and boundary setting by the women participants because both they and their colleagues are uncomfortable with them adopting traditionally more male-oriented characteristics. The women feel as though they are violating both social norms and their own desires to be warm, giving, and helpful. In many instances their colleagues appeared to feel similarly and reacted negatively to them when they deviated from the status quo thereby implicating the conflict between being respected and liked. Despite their own misgivings and potential negative feedback from their colleagues, many of the women stated that in order to survive professionally, they had to assume new ways of relating.

Recommendations

The participants' recommendations, both to other women and to universities, reflect that which is most important to them. Overall, the women appeared to want two things. First, they desired having supportive relationships that would help them negotiate both the personal and professional aspects of their lives. Second, they seemed to want to reshape the culture of academia to better reflect the pluralistic values, priorities, and lives of the diverse members counseling psychology and the larger academic community. Instead of adapting themselves to the traditional rules, ideals, and expectations of the traditional academy, the participants wanted the academy to compromise and make some attempt to value and respect their goals and needs.

As a researcher and as a member of the academy who has had similar experiences to those of the participants, my recommendations for both women and universities are similar to the assistant professors who shared their opinions in this study. I believe that for women, mentoring and friendship are crucial for emotional, psychological, personal, and professional success. The formation of supportive groups may also change the culture of the academy and lessen some of the competition and isolation so often found in counseling psychology departments as well as other departments in research universities.

Furthermore, universities must do more to support their female faculty who choose to have children. In my view, eliminating the currently flourishing covert and overt discrimination against mothers is imperative. Without the creation of true family friendly policies and explicit support for women and children, equity for female professors with children will not occur.

Personal Journey

As a doctoral student in a counseling psychology program, I have observed female faculty struggle with many of the issues that were investigated in this study. As a female, I have experienced many of these issues for myself, albeit from the slightly different perspective of a doctoral student. During my first two years in the doctoral program, I believe that I had an experience that reflected that of many female counseling psychology faculty without children. I was dedicated to my chosen profession and had limited responsibilities outside of fulfilling my academic, research, and clinical commitments. I was easily able to balance my professional life with my personal life which primarily consisted of spending time with my husband, family and friends.

Although I did not receive much mentorship because of the advisor to whom I had been assigned, I felt relatively supported by other faculty members and peers.

However, at the beginning of my third year in the doctoral program, I gave birth to a son. This profoundly changed my experiences as a doctoral student. I was fortunate to have connected with two female faculty who provided mentorship. However, one of the female faculty members left soon after I began working with her. She had found academic life to be incompatible with her other role as a mother of two young children. The other female faculty member continued to provide support. However, despite her best efforts, she was unable to assist with some of the more nuanced aspects of counseling psychology because she was a faculty member in a different program.

My experiences with some of the other faculty in the department and even, at times with fellow doctoral students, were not overly positive. The description of colleagues' negative reactions to advanced doctoral students' choices to have children struck close to home. I was unable to be singularly devoted to the department and the priorities and values of many of the faculty which included seeking prestigious internship sites, being a prolific writer, researcher, and presenter at conferences, and generally spending significant amounts of time in the department. I often felt that my choices were viewed as burdensome, were not respected or valued, and were seen as career limiting decisions that I would come to regret. It frequently felt as though there was one "right" way to be in the department; one "right" way to fulfill the requirements of a counseling psychology doctoral student. I perceived that any deviation from the status quo was unacceptable and not understood.

Moreover, the way in which the internship system is structured privileges those who have the freedom and ability to uproot their lives and move frequently to secure an internship site for one year and then move again for a postdoctoral fellowship. As a mother and wife of a man with an inflexible career, I had geographic limitations and personal responsibilities that prohibited me from a national search for the most prestigious internship site. It was my choice to have a child. However, operating within the rigid, often unsupportive confines of academia frequently felt completely incompatible with my life outside of counseling psychology – I do not believe that it should or must be this way.

Luckily, I befriended a fellow student who was also a new mother and doctoral student. This informal mentorship and friendship provided me with the support I needed to persevere in this somewhat inhospitable climate. We helped each other negotiate the "intersection of the personal and the professional," empathized with each other's struggles, and relished each other's successes. I also received support from other students – some of whom had children and some who did not. There words of encouragement and support were crucial to my ability to succeed as a counseling psychology doctoral student.

Giving voice to the participants in the study was thrilling and confirmed my suspicions that female assistant professors with children would have quite a bit to express and contribute about their experiences, frustrations, hopes, and aspirations. For that reason, interviewing these women and conveying their stories seemed important, not only for their sake, but also to hopefully shed some light on some of the shortcomings in the field of counseling psychology and the system of academia more broadly.

From an emotional perspective, working on this study elicited a multitude of reactions. Hearing the women's stories was both angering and normalizing. The stories were angering because of the difficulties that these talented women encountered due to their gender and their most basic human desire to have children. Bearing witness to their experiences was normalizing because they so closely matched my own in many ways. I felt a camaraderie with the participants due to our similar positions as women, mothers, and as members of the counseling psychology academy.

Due to the solidarity with the other women, I also felt hopeful that the culture of academia may shift. This is likely to be a slow evolution. However, this study gives voice to the women who otherwise may not have had a safe forum in which to express their grievances. This may be a catalyst to jumpstart the process.

Strengths and Limitations

This study had a number of strengths that add to its credibility. The inclusion of a homogeneous group of participants adds to the trustworthiness of the study as only limited variability was introduced into the sample. Also, the study design, with its multiple layers of coding and analysis of the data, makes the study highly rigorous and offsets a large portion of the potential bias that will be discussed below. Finally, the data were sufficiently triangulated through emersion in the literature, use of feminist oriented member-checking procedures, and the thorough social constructivist coding process.

The principle limitation of this study is possible bias. The questions, although based on information in the literature, were designed to elicit responses on particular subject matter and directed the participants to respond in a particular vein. Moreover, researcher's personal biases, as a mother academic in counseling psychology, likely

influenced the interview protocol construction, the code book, and the interpretation of the data.

Implications for Research

As stated previously, there is little empirical research on this topic. This study opens the floodgates for numerous possible qualitative and quantitative investigations to further our understanding of the intractability of the gender gap in tenure and promotion. For example, future qualitative research could compare the experiences of women with and without children or the experiences of men and women. These studies would continue to provide additional layers to our knowledge about the journey to tenure and promotion. Other qualitative investigations could answer questions about how women who did succeed professionally managed to do this – what sacrifices did they make, what challenges did they encounter, and what factors allowed them to achieve their professional goals? Psychology as a whole could be investigated to determine the consistency of these themes across areas of specialization.

Moreover, future research could look at each of the factors evidenced in this study in greater depth. For example, pilot studies or pre/post-test experiments could be conducted to determine if implementing new mentoring programs, better maternity leave packages, or family friendly policies and/or insuring pay equity improved rates of tenure and promotion among women faculty. Also, techniques could be borrowed from the social psychology literature to measure implicit bias in faculty and administrators.

Finally, additional research needs to be undertaken and policy changes need to be implemented in order to better support women academics in all scientific fields. The academy, like any other important societal institution needs a balanced perspective.

Research must be generated by representatives from all segments of the population. Through equal representation at all levels of this hierarchical entity, the academy will be in a better position to adequately provide scientifically supported answers to questions relevant to everyone.

Conclusion

This study's principal goal was achieved - the data indicates that there are five primary factors that are inhibiting women's success in counseling psychology academia. These primary factors include (1) the culture and climate of the academy and the departments, (2) the lack of necessary and appropriate mentorship, (3) the demands of and lack of support for work/family conflict, (4) on-going overt and covert gender discrimination, and (5) the emotional and psychological strain women experience. The participants' recommendations evidence achievement of the study's second goal - to provide women with a forum to safely discuss their experiences in and hopes for their profession. The study also is able to validate, expand upon, and in some cases, dispute the findings in the literature up to this point. Finally, as an early empirical effort, this study provides directions for future research in this area.

References

American Psychological Association Presidential Initiative on Work and Families. (2004). *Public policy, work, and families: The report of the APA presidential initiative on work and families.* Washington, DC: Author.

American Psychological Association Taskforce on Women in Academe. (2000). *Women In Academe: Two Steps Forward, One Step Back.* Washington, DC: Author.

Barnett, R.C. (2004). Preface: Woman and work: Where are we, where did we come from, and where are we going? *Journal of Social Issues, 60,* 667-674.

Bogdan, R.C., & Biklen, S.K. (Eds.). (2003). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theories and methods* (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Bond, J.T., Thompson, C., Galinsky, E., & Prottas, D. (2002). *Highlights of the national study of the changing workforce executive summary* (Report No. 3). Washington, DC: Families and Work Institute.

Capaldi, E. D. (2004). Power, politics, and survival in academia. In J. M. Darley, M. P. Zanna, & H. L. Roediger III (Eds.), *The Compleat Academic: A Career Guide* (pp. 245-257). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association

Caplan, P. J. (2003). Balancing career and family. In M. J. Prinstein & M. D. Patterson (Eds.), *The Portable Mentor: Expert Guide to a Successful Career in Psychology* (pp. 45-54). New York, NY: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers

Charmaz, K. (2000). Grounded theory: Objectivist and constructivist methods. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.) *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (2nd ed., pp. 509-535). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Cohen, H. (2002, August 4). The baby bias. *The New York Times,* Education Life Section.

Counseling psychology programs approved by the APA (2005, October). Retrieved October 15, 2005, from htpp://www.apa.org/ed/accreditation/counspsy.html

Crosby, F. J., Williams, J. C., & Biernat, M. (2004). The maternal wall. *Journal of Social Issues, 60,* 675-682.

Cuddy, A. J. C., Fiske, S. T., & Glick, P. (2004). When professionals become mothers, warmth doesn't cut the ice. *Journal of Social Issues, 60,* 701-718.

Curtis, J. W. (2004). Balancing work and family for faculty: Why it's important. [Electronic version]. *Academe, 90,* np. Retrieved March 5, 2005, from http://www.aaup.org/publications/Academe/2004/04nd/04ndcurtis.htm

Deutsch, F. M., & Saxon, S. E. (1998). The double standard of praise and criticism for mothers and fathers. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 22,* 665-683.

Drago, R., & Williams, J. (2000). A half-time tenure track proposal. *Change, November/December,* 47-51.

Dinerman, B. (1971). Sex discrimination in academia. *Journal of Higher Education, 42,* 253-264.

Eberspacher, J, & Sisler, G. (1988). Mentor relationships in academic administration. *Initiatives, 51,* 27-32.

Erickson, C. D., & Rodriguez, E. R. (1999). Indiana Jane and the Temples of Doom: Recommendations for enhancing women and racial/ethnic faculty's success in academia. *Innovative Higher Education, 24,* 149-168.

Feldman, D. C. (1976). A contingency theory of socialization. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 21,* 433-452.

Fouad, N. A. & Carter, R. T. (1992). Gender and racial issues for new counseling psychologists in academia. *The Counseling Psychologist, 20,* 123-140.

Giorgi, A. (1997). The theory, practice, and evaluation of the phenomenological method as a qualitative research procedure. *Journal of Phenomenological Psychology, 28,* 235-260.

Golafshani, N. (2003). Understanding reliability and validity in qualitative research. [Electronic version] *The Qualitative Report, 8,* 597-607. Retrieved July 22, 2007 from http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR-4/golafshami.pdf.

Hackett, G., Betz, N. E., & Doty, M. S. (1985). The development of a taxonomy of career competencies for professional women. *Sex Roles, 12,* 393-409.

Halpern, D. (2004, November). Obstacles to female full professorship: Another civil - rights issue. *Monitor on Psychology, 35,* 5.

Halpert, J. A., Wilson, M. L, Hickman, J.L. (1993). Pregnancy as a source of bias in performance appraisals. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 14,* 1993).

Hill, C. E., Thompson, B. J., & Williams, E. N. (1997). A guide to conducting consensual qualitative research. *The Counseling Psychologist, 25,* 517-572.

Hill, C. E., Thompson, B. J., Hess, S. A., Knox, S., Williams, E. N. & Nicholas, L. (2005). Consensual qualitative research: An update. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 52,* 196-205.

Kelloway, E. K., Gottlieb, B. H., & Barham, L. (1999). The source, nature, and direction of work and family conflict: A longitudinal investigation. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 4,* 337-346.

Kite, M. E., Russo, N. F., Brehm, S. S., Fouad, N.A., Iijima Hall, C. C., Hyde, J. S., Keita, G. P. (2001). Women psychologists in academe: Mixed progresss, unwarranted complacency. *American Psychologist, 56,* 1080-1098.

Knights, D., & Richards, W. (2003). Sex discrimination in UK academia. *Gender, Work, and Organization, 10,* 213-238.

Knox, P. L., & McGovern, T. V. (1988). Mentoring women in academia. *Teaching Of Psychology, 15,* 39-41.

Lobel, S. (2004). Working part time after tenure. [Electronic version]. *Academe, 90,* np. Retrieved March 5, 2005, from http://www.aaup.org/publications/Academe/2004/04nd/04ndlobe.htm

Marwell, G., Rosenfeld, R., & Spilerman, S. (1979). Geographic constraints on women's careers in academia. *Science, 21,* 1225-1231.

Nelson & Burke (Eds.). (2002). *Gender, work, stress, and health.* Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Olesen, V. (1994). Feminisms and models of qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 158-174). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Olesen, V. (2000). Feminisms and qualitative research at and into the millennium. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.) *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (2nd ed., pp. 215-255). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Park, D. C., & Nolen-Hoeksema, S. (2004). Women in academia. In J. M. Darley, M. P. Zanna, & H. L. Roediger III (Eds.), *The Compleat Academic: A Career Guide* (pp. 311-328). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association

Phillips, A., & Daniluk, J. C. (2004). Beyond "survivor": How childhood sexual abuse informs the identity of adult women at the end of the therapeutic process. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 82,* 177-184.

Ponterotto, J.G. (2005). Qualitative research in counseling psychology: A primer on research paradigms and philosophy of science. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 52,* 126-136.

Quinn, K., Lane, S. E., & Olswang, S. G. (2004). Family-friendly policies and the research university. [Electronic version]. *Academe, 90,* np. Retrieved March 5, 2005, from http://www.aaup.org/publications/Academe/2004/04nd/04ndquin.htm

Rabasca, L. (2000, November). In search of equality: An APA task force recommends ways to ensure more equality for women in academe. *Monitor on Psychology, 31.*

Ridgeway, C. L., & Correll, S. J. (2004). Motherhood as a status characteristic. *Journal of Social Issues, 60,* 683-700.

Rooke, P. (1989). Re-ordering our partiality: Reflections on careerism and feminist commitment in academia. *The Journal of Educational Thought, 23,* 106-119.

Sherif, M., White, B. J., & Harvey, O. J. (1955). Status in experimentally produced groups. *American Journal of Sociology, 60,* 370-379.

Stemler, S. E. (2004). A comparison of consensus, consistency, and measurement approaches to estimating inter-rater reliability. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation,* 9. Retrieved July 22, 2007 from http://PAREonline.net/getvn.asp?v=9&n=4.

Sullivan, B., Hollenshead, C., & Smith, G. (2004). Developing and implementing work-family policies for faculty. [Electronic version]. *Academe, 90,* np. Retrieved March 5, 2005, from http://www.aaup.org/publications/Academe/-2004/04nd/04ndsull.htm

Ward, K. & Wolf-Wendel, L. (2004). Fear factor: How safe is it to make time for family? [Electronic version]. *Academe, 90,* np. Retrieved March 5, 2005, from http://www.aaup.org/publications/Academe/2004/04nd/04ndward.htm

Williams, J. C. (2000). *Unbending gender.* Oxford, London: Oxford University Press.

Williams, J. C. (2002). "It's snowing down south": How to help mothers and avoid recycling the sameness/difference debate. *Columbia University Law Review, 102,* 812-847.

Williams, J. C. (2004). Hitting the maternal wall. [Electronic version]. *Academe, 90,* np. Retrieved March 5, 2005, from http://www.aaup.org/publications/-Academe/2004/04nd/04ndtoc.htm

Williams, J. C. (2005). The social psychology of stereotyping: Using social science to litigate gender discrimination cases and defang the "cluelessness" defense. *Employee Rights and Employment Policy Journal, 7,* 101-154.

Young, C. Y., & Wright, J. V. (2001). Mentoring: The components for success. *Journal of Instructional Psychology, 28,* 202-206.